

the Middle West and especially strong in Wisconsin. It would have been easy and politically advantageous for the Senator to exploit these sentiments for political advantage.

But Senator Wiley in a decision of courage and conviction, risked his career by using the great office of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to advance America's responsibility both in the United Nations and in helping countries throughout the world.

When he ran for reelection in 1956 Senator Wiley paid the price when he faced the most vigorous kind of opposition in the Republican primary in Wisconsin. He was opposed by an extraordinarily able opponent. He lost the endorsement of his party. He had to fight for renomination alone against the entire Republican organization in Wisconsin. He won and went on to a landslide general election victory.

Mr. President, the country has lost a fine and decent man. Wisconsin has lost a son of which it can be proud.

TRIBUTE TO MOHAMMAD REZA SHAH PAHLAVI ON THE OCCASION OF HIS CORONATION AS KING OF IRAN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a very unusual event that is taking place in Iran today—the coronation of a monarch 26 years after he ascended the throne and to the particular significance of this delay.

Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi declined to be crowned when he came to the throne in 1941. He declared at that time that it was no honor for him to reign over a nation in which a large portion of the people were destitute. The young Shah immediately dedicated himself to the task of improving the social and economic condition of the citizens of his country. Behind the pageantry and festivities that will accompany the coronation ceremonies in Iran today lies a quarter of a century of solid economic and social progress.

The Shah has proven to be a true revolutionary leader and, under his guidance, the economic and social face of Iran is being changed.

Iran's progress is also of special interest for it provides a heartening example of the contribution that our AID programs can make in a developing area when accompanied by political stability and enlightened local leadership. Our AID assistance to Iran is now coming to an end because the country has achieved the economic momentum to move forward on its own. We are terminating our economic assistance to Iran because the goals of our AID program have been largely achieved. This has been possible because the Iranian Government has made good use of the assistance that it has received from us and others, and because it has been ready and willing to undertake the sacrifices necessary for economic development.

Much of the credit for Iran's successful utilization of American economic assistance goes to the determination and efforts of Iranian leadership to provide economic and social progress for the peo-

ple of Iran. We are all too aware that this is not always the case in countries that are the beneficiaries of large amounts of American AID.

The United States has provided Iran a total of \$886,600,000 in economic assistance since 1951. As a result of this large expenditure of U.S. funds—over a period during which the country faced a number of severe political and economic crises—Iran is today a stable, prospering, independent land and a firm member of the family of free nations.

In his determination to develop his nation economically and socially, the Shah has not been satisfied merely to seek foreign assistance. Rather, under the Shah's personal leadership, Iran has devoted an ever increasing amount of its own resources to development programs. At present some 80 percent of the nation's substantial revenue from oil production is being used for development projects. During the period 1955 to 1962, U.S. economic assistance to Iran amounted to some \$566 million. During this same period, Iranian investment in development totaled \$1.2 billion, a ratio of almost 3 to 1. In the latest period, 1963-66, the ratio of Iranian expenditures for development to U.S. economic assistance was better than 10 to 1. Iran spent \$1.5 billion on development projects during these years compared to a total of \$136 million received in American assistance.

In recent years American corporations have shown increasing interest in investment in Iran, attracted both by the continuing economic growth of the country and the political stability that it enjoys. The flow of private American investment capital into Iran has now replaced U.S. Government assistance funds, and the rate of American investments in Iran is steadily increasing as new opportunities in the expanding economy develop.

Today, Iran is a billion-dollar import market, and the United States is Iran's second largest supplier, having supplied almost 20 percent of Iran's total imports last year. The size of this market is expected to double over the next 5 years, offering another billion-dollar opportunity for trade growth.

These are a few of the positive results that have sprung from the Shah's successful revolution. The coronation today will climax the first phase of this revolution. But the revolution in Iran is continuing and the country and its citizens can look forward to even greater advances.

I think that we would all wish to join in offering the Shah our congratulations on this occasion and to extend our best wishes to him and to his people.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS FOLLOWING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills presented to him today, even following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1967, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 26, 1967:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Claude F. Clayton, of Mississippi, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit.

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Howard J. Samuels, of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1967

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Reverend R. L. Miller, Greater Institutional A.M.E. Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, the might of all who trust in Thee, look with mercy upon us as a nation and with concern upon these our legislative fathers who hold the responsibility of her public peace, law, and order, and the togetherness of her citizens of varied races and nationalities. May they never forget their answerableness to the people whom they serve, and to that people's God; nor ever lose their patriotism in partisanship, their ministry of social responsibility in material servility, their vision of truth in the stigmatism of petty considerations. Direct their counsels, strengthen their hands to honesty of purpose, that the life of our people, guided by wise policies, may be a nation pleasing in Thy sight, thus we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballol and wife, Lucia J. Caballol.

The message also announced that the Vice President appointed the following Senators to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting to be held in Rome December 3 to 9, 1967: Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho.

THE REVEREND R. L. MILLER

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we have one of the outstanding citizens of the city of Chicago who gave the invocation at the opening of the session of the House of Representatives, the Reverend R. L. Miller, minister and executive director of schools of the Greater Institutional A.M.E. Church of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Miller is one of the outstanding clergymen of the city of Chicago.

As an alderman in the city of Chicago for many years, it was my pleasure to have the church which Reverend Miller represents in my ward and later in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. However, today that church is now located in the congressional district which the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON represents.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Miller was one of the outstanding men involved in the city life and the community action programs of our area.

It is with great honor today that I am happy he gave the invocation at the opening of this session of the House.

LOOPHOLES IN OUR TAX LAWS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the only two things we have to worry about for certain are death and taxes. Well, the major oil companies in America can devote all their time worrying about death because when it comes to taxes, they have it made.

The loopholes in our tax laws, most specifically the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance, have put these companies in a position of rolling in profits while the rest of the American people pay their way. Last year the 20 major oil com-

panies in America had a net clear profit of over \$4¾ billion and yet paid taxes to their country of only 8½ percent. How many of our hard-working low- or high-paid constituents are in an 8½-percent tax bracket?

To attempt to rectify this gross injustice and unfair burden on the American people, I have just filed a discharge petition, which is at the Clerk's desk, to discharge the bill, H.R. 655, which will reduce the oil depletion allowance and invite the oil companies into the mainstream of American taxation along with the rest of us. I urge my colleagues, who feel that their constituents should not be forced to dig 10 percent deeper into their pockets for a tax increase until the oil companies pay their fair share, to join with me in signing this discharge petition.

THE CONGRESSIONAL NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, with the firm expectation of being designated poet laureate of the 90th Congress, I offer the following poem which I have composed. Like all great bards, I will be available for public readings if the demand is audible, however faint. My poem follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS

'Twas the night before Christmas, and all through the House,
They still were in session, and the Members did grouse.

Piled high in the cloakroom, suitcases stood by,

In the hope that proceedings would end sine die.

The business at hand was the Bow amendment.

Across-the-board slashes of ninety per cent.
Pucinski, Kluczynski, Derwinski were there,
Rodino, Paul Fino, Hébert and Adair.

Kelly and Pelly, O'Hara and Zion.
Chairman Bill Colmer with pal William Ryan.
Dawson and Clausen and Broomfield and Brock.

Pirnie and Gurney and Pickle and Zwach.
Blatnik and Resnick, Van Deerlin and Morse.
Johnson and Olsen and Joelson, of course.

Robert Mathias, so manly and strong.
Schadeberg, Schwengel, and Dingell and Long.

Whalen, Cohelan, Gonzalez, and Yates.
And Patman deploring those high interest rates.

Irwin and Kirwan, McCulloch, McClure.
And Mink from Hawaii, petite and demure.
Rooney and Tunney and Green, White, and Gray

A Wolf known as Lester, a Steed with a Bray.
As the session continued, the moon's mellow rays

Shone on reticent Gross and on mild-mannered Hays.

And pounding the gavel, McCormack then roared,

"On Albert, on Hale Boggs." "On Arends," cried Ford.

They held a brief huddle, considered and then

Announced that they'd meet on tomorrow at ten.

And I heard Fishbait say as he locked the doors tight,
"Happy Christmas to all and to all a good night."

RIGHTS OF MINORITY DEFENDED

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll this morning reports that more people in the United States are against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam than are in favor of it, and I think that it is important for those of us in the majority to insist that the views of the minority who favor this war be respected.

Just because Vice President HUMPHREY, Secretary Rusk, Congressman FORD, Senator DIRKSEN, and Gov. Ronald Reagan represent the views of a dwindling minority does not mean that they should be vilified or their patriotism questioned.

We in the majority should remind one another that free speech is basic to the good health of our Nation. Let the minority have their say. Let them demonstrate. Let them march. Should this minority decide to march to the Pentagon, I am confident that their actions will be peaceful, nonviolent, and that they will clean up their litter.

GALLUP VIETNAM POLL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thought that I was literate and I read the Gallup poll report, but I did not read it the same way the gentleman from California read it. I read it as saying that an additional group of people had thought it was a mistake to have gotten involved in Vietnam but that a majority were still in favor of our position.

I know anybody ought to know that hindsight is better than foresight and I suppose nearly anyone might say maybe we never should have gotten involved there, but the point is that we are involved there. I believe it is pretty significant that a poll taken by a labor organization that had over 5,000 replies, of which 37 percent said we should increase or accelerate what we were doing in Vietnam, 42 percent said we should remain at the same level, 7 percent said we should decelerate, and 7 percent said we should not be there at all, we should pull out.

I believe the majority are still backing the policy of the United States and I believe that the majority are not led by the creeps and the beatniks and the dirty, filthy people who were evident and obvious on TV in the demonstration at the Pentagon. One of the soldiers said a

good many of them acted like Tarzan, looked like Jane, and smelled like Cheetah.

MARIHUANA, YES—TOBACCO, NO

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am completely astounded at the attitude of officials in different bureaus within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and elsewhere in the executive branch.

For some 3 years now, the Public Health Service under the leadership of former Surgeon General Dr. Luther Terry and his successor the present Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, has waged unrelenting warfare against cigarette smoking. At their insistence, Congress acted to require that each package of cigarettes be labeled with the statement: "Warning, cigarette smoking may be hazardous to health." They sought much harsher measures which would have required similar statements to be contained in all cigarette advertising.

The Federal Communications Commission took up the cry, and under the "fairness doctrine" required radio and television broadcasters to provide free time to those who believe cigarette smoking is dangerous to health to "answer" paid advertising.

Now, Dr. James Goddard, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, has publicly stated that he believes penalties provided for those convicted of the sale and use of marihuana are too harsh and that he believes our society can tolerate legalized use of marihuana as well as it does the legal use of alcohol.

Can any knowledgeable person possibly doubt that the use of marihuana tends to promote irresponsible conduct; that it can cause loss of motor ability and result in automobile accidents and similarly dangerous situations? That persons "high" on marihuana have been known to jump out of windows under the impression that they could fly? That it reduces inhibitions and promotes promiscuity? Or that it is often the first step toward experimentation with other drugs like LSD and heroin?

It goes without saying that when the Federal Government is waging an all-out battle against something as mild as cigarettes which bring in millions of dollars of legitimate tax revenues and provide a livelihood for hundreds of thousands of people, something is badly out of kilter when out of the other side of its mouth, it talks about legalizing marihuana.

THE GREAT DETROIT SMOG CAPER

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, next week may mark a significant milestone in public affairs. When Senate bill 780, the Air Quality Act, comes to the floor, House Members will have a chance to prove that no segment of private industry is bigger than the people of the United States.

For far too long, the automobile industry, swaggering through our House office buildings with highhanded lobbyists—some of them paid up to \$100 an hour—has sought to impose auto management's selfish interests over the judgment of the American public.

Last year we saw a campaign first to prevent, then to weaken, auto safety legislation. This arrogant campaign was marked by efforts to destroy the character of a man who had done most to call public attention to unsafe cars.

More recently, the swarm from Detroit has zeroed in on the Clean Air Act, as that bill faces up to a prime cause of pollution—the toxic emissions that pour from nearly 130 million automobiles.

Detroit wants a bill that will reduce controls to a minimum. And just as Detroit's carpetbaggers sought to destroy Ralph Nader, they now seek to smash the police powers of the States in a vital field of health and safety.

I invite colleagues to join in rolling back the pall of smog these slick operators have sought to spread through this legislative Hall—to prove with their votes next week that Detroit is not the capital of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thanks and appreciation for the fact that Admiral Rickover has agreed to stay on active duty for another 2 years.

I do not know and I do not suppose many other people know of all the lucrative offers that he has received and by which he has been tempted to enter private industry.

It is because of Admiral Rickover's constant devotion to duty, Mr. Speaker, that nuclear propulsion for the fleet of submarines that we have now, both attack and Polaris, is a reality; and because of his extreme devotion to duty we are now beginning to get nuclear propulsion for more of our surface navy.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is indeed lucky that this dedicated American will wear the uniform for another 2 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from South Carolina in congratulating our Navy for keeping Admiral

Rickover on duty. I think that Admiral Rickover is one of the greatest Americans of this century and he certainly has made one of the greatest contributions to get for this country a nuclear-powered Navy.

I hope that Admiral Rickover serves for many, many years longer. We need more men like that in the Navy.

Fifteen years ago I spent the night aboard the *Nautilus* and shared the same cabin with Admiral Rickover. He talked until late that night about the possibility of firing missiles from submerged submarines—a system that later became Polaris. Admiral Rickover is unquestionably the father of the Polaris. In my opinion had it not been for Admiral Rickover we would have no Polaris system today. The Polaris system is unquestionably the finest deterrent that we have.

Admiral Rickover is a great American and is no doubt making a great personal and financial sacrifice to continue serving in the Navy. This is further evidence of his devoted, unselfish service to his country.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in paying tribute to Admiral Rickover. I understand that the admiral has decided to serve for 2 more years. I congratulate him and wish him the very best.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, this country will never be able to thank this man enough for the fight that he is making today to get a surface nuclear Navy for this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, patriotic and sound-thinking Americans can but applaud and demand the continuation of Vice Adm. Hyman George Rickover, U.S. Navy, on active service as head of the Navy's nuclear power directorate.

Almost 10 years ago a photograph accompanying an article published in the New York Times showed the then Rear Admiral Rickover standing in a civilian suit of clothes, with his vision fixed on some distant point, with a painting of a naval ship in the background, and with two telephones a handgrasp away on a desk in the foreground. The article itself helped to explain these elements of the photographic composition. It stated that the admiral "has been driven to greatness and controversy by a consuming personal philosophy that 'the more you sweat in peace the less you bleed in war.'" It pointed out that "in peace and war, the admiral stands forth as a leader in this country—and in the world—in harnessing nuclear energy. More than any other man, he was responsible for two epochal achievements"—the first atomic-powered submarine, followed by a growing fleet of sister ships and atomic-powered surface ships, and the world's "first large-scale, all-civilian atomic

powerplant" at Shippingport, Pa. The article also observed that "his disdain for established procedures almost cut short his naval career before he could score his atomic triumphs."

Ten years ago the Nation, due in no small measure to congressional insistence, was indeed fortunate and blessed to have Admiral Rickover still on active duty. Today the Congress should and must express its conviction that Admiral Rickover should and must continue "on the job."

It is not that the admiral is irreplaceable. After all, who really is? The point, rather, is that the kind of service that Admiral Rickover has performed for the Nation and the Navy is of vital importance so long as he is willing and able to render it.

Last January, in the course of accepting the Franklin Medal for Distinguished Service, an honor bestowed on him by the Printing Industries of Metropolitan New York, the admiral affirmed that "what seems to me of utmost importance is that we never for a moment forget that a free society centers on man." Public service based on such an attitude and conviction is the kind of service of which the Nation and the Navy must avail themselves for so long as they can.

Admiral Rickover, whether he be speaking out on nuclear propulsion, education in the present era of science and technology, campaign costs as a factor in democratic elections, or the pitfalls of dehumanized national defense decision-making, contributes to the national defense and the well-being of national life, generally the kind of perspicacity and moral courage without which the United States of America cannot endure peacefully, purposefully, and honorably.

AMERICAN FISHING BOAT FIRED ON AND SEIZED ON THE HIGH SEAS

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of this House should know that another American tuna fishing boat, 70 miles off the coast of Ecuador, was fired on and taken into custody by an Ecuadorian patrol boat on Friday, October 20.

According to information furnished me by our Department of State, the vessel, *Puritan*, legally fishing on the high seas, was first subjected to small arms fire and then seized. Fortunately, no American was killed in this latest act of piracy by Ecuador, although the vessel suffered bullet damage in the hull. The *Puritan* was taken into port and not released until 26 hours later.

Mr. Speaker, I have urged and introduced legislation to provide Coast Guard protection for fishing vessels flying the American flag off South America, but our Government would rather pay ransom.

No wonder the United States is losing respect throughout the world.

GUIDING DIRECTION IN LETTERS REGARDING OEO PROGRAMS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to share an experience with me and see if they draw the same conclusion that I have.

Back in August and September I began receiving letters in praise of the Office of Economic Opportunity. You will note that these letters all come on the same size paper, apparently all from the same pad, many of them apparently written with the same ball point pen.

One of the letters started:

Hon. Congressman ROGER ZION: In response to the request of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I am writing you this letter.

More recently I have received letters that apparently were mimeographed. Very few constituents in my small towns are equipped with mimeograph machines. Now I am getting king-sized letters, with the watermark of the U.S. Government apparently on the paper.

I would like to call attention to title 18, section 913, of the United States Code, specifying:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if a violation of law has occurred, I want the Justice Department to evaluate this. I am going to send the material to them. I think it is reprehensible if fine, decent people who have a real need for an effective poverty program are being misused in this manner.

BYWAY BEAUTNIK CORPS ON CAPE COD

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, any friend of Cape Cod knows that its best season is not summer, when beaches are jammed, roads clogged, and shops crowded with souvenir seekers. Real Cape Codders know that the best time to be on Cape Cod is the fall—the so-called Indian summer—when full foliage colors the trees, crisp breezes invigorate spirits, and near-deserted beaches beckon the solitary stroller or beachcomber.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the traditional enticements of Cape Cod are enhanced by the opportunity to join in a massive, organized litter campaign. The Byway

Beautnik Corps, conceived by Emil A. Hanslin, of New Seabury on Cape Cod, will strew millions of wildflower seeds along the roads of Cape Cod.

This highway beautification plan, which entails no cost to the taxpayer, is a unique example of old yankee do-it-yourself tradition—a sharp and agreeable contrast to the all too prevalent let-the-government-do-it attitude. When millions of wildflowers turn Cape Cod into a flower garden, that other brand of litterbug might be less inclined to chuck beer cans and candy wrappers from car windows.

Mr. Speaker, as a corporal in the Byway Beautnik Corps, I am inviting my colleagues to enlist. There are no dues, no rules, no ranks. Each corporal is issued a free packet of wildflower seeds, a knatty yellow and black badge, and a certificate suitable for framing. He is authorized and encouraged to strew wildflower seeds wherever he wishes.

Mr. Speaker, membership in the Byway Beautnik Corps offers unparalleled opportunities for unrestricted littering, as well as an unbeatable excuse to visit Cape Cod in its prime season. I anticipate encountering many of my Washington-weary colleagues along the dunes of Cape Cod, sporting a Beautnik badge and littering with license.

FAILURE OF CONFEREES ON FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION TO REACH AGREEMENT OR REPORT BACK IN DISAGREEMENT

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to commend briefly on the continuing failure of the conferees on the foreign aid authorization to reach agreement—or to report back in disagreement on certain issues. A friend of mine asked me recently if this was a stall or a stalemate—and I was not able to answer him. Certainly if this session of Congress is to adjourn it would seem necessary for the conference committee to reach some compromise, or at least for the House conferees to seek advice from our colleagues regarding our failure to reach final agreement.

The conference committee, consisting of 11 members of the other body and seven of us from the Foreign Affairs Committee, first met on September 14, 6 weeks ago today. Our task was—and still is—to discuss no less than 89 differences between the bills passed by the House and the other body. Agreement has been reached as to many of these differences, but important issues still remain unresolved.

I am calling attention to this situation, Mr. Speaker, because in the 6 weeks since discussions first began there have been no meetings at all of the conference committee for 3 of those weeks. The first week wasted came about because of the ab-

sence of two conferees from the other body. For reasons of their own they were not in Washington the last week in September.

Even more regrettable, there have been no meetings of the conference committee since October 12. Nothing has been done either this week or last because of the absence from the Nation's Capital of one conferee from the other body. Even if it was felt that no final agreement could be reached because of the absence of a single individual, it is unfortunate that the 10 other conferees could not meet and discuss with the House conferees the differences which still need resolution.

PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL IN NOVEMBER PLAYBOY

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, no matter how strong this country considers itself to be, it cannot withstand the continued massive injections of pornographic material that are flooding the mails and reaching our youngsters. No better example of this can be found than an article in the November 1967 issue of Playboy magazine at page 154 purportedly discussing "Stag Movies" but utterly without redeeming social or intellectual value. With photographs this article is pure pornographic prurency.

If Supreme Court decisions are considered to make lawful the distribution of this sort of material then it is a tragedy of misinterpretation. I do not believe even the present U.S. Supreme Court would fail to hold this obscene.

More important is the question of precisely whom it was within the staff of Playboy itself who first, of course, had to see this material in draft and then approve and direct its distribution throughout America. This person ought to be tarred and feathered.

Mr. Speaker, the use of the mails should be denied to pornography of this type. The U.S. Attorney General should act to protect the families of this Nation from material that is plainly designed to demoralize our Nation and particularly its very young.

The Government should act to stop this smut and the Supreme Court should help not hinder the effort.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 823)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments Nos. 1 and 2 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) "making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,925,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Research and development

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$3,925,000,000 for "Research and development" instead of \$3,899,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,995,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has added \$10,000,000 for tracking and data acquisition, and \$15,500,000 over the amount proposed by the House for the Apollo applications program, with the understanding that the Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate Committees of the Congress.

Construction of facilities

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$35,900,000 for "Construction of facilities" as pro-

posed by the House instead of \$55,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we bring back to the House today two conference reports, one for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and one for the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations for 1968.

These matters have been thoroughly debated earlier this week. There have been record votes and issues are well known.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Members that the House has won both conferences. The bills provide appropriations of \$14,728,373,900. This is a 6.3-percent reduction for independent offices and HUD appropriations, and a 10-percent reduction on the appropriations for NASA, making a total cut in the two bills of \$1,192,139,800 below the budget estimates.

These two bills have always gone together, but they were separated this year because of a delay in the passage of the authorization bill for NASA.

This cut is almost \$1.2 billion.

The other body yielded on \$465 million, whereas the House yielded on only \$131 million. This was a 78-percent reduction on the part of the Senate.

We feel that the House won this conference decisively, with the Senate yielding on most of the major points.

In regard to the specific programs in NASA, the Senate added \$35 million for the Apollo applications program to the \$300 million the House had provided previously. They added \$36 million for the Voyager program. The House had not approved any funds for that program.

The other two items in this further conference relate to the nuclear rocket program. The Senate had added \$10 million for research and \$19,500,000 for construction. The other body has yielded on both of these items.

Total dollar differences between the two bodies in this conference was \$100,500,000. They have yielded to the extent of \$85 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House has yielded with reference to the sum of \$10 million on the tracking facilities. This has to do with commitments and contracts with foreign governments for the operation of the tracking facilities which are vital to the safety of our astronauts.

In the conference just completed we have added \$15.5 million to Apollo applications.

Mr. Speaker, there are 20 items in research and development. We did not fund

any specific amount for the Voyager or for the NERVA programs but we have language in the statement of the managers which states, in effect, that if the Administrator feels that other projects in research and development are of a higher priority and of greater interest to the United States, he then may ask for reprogramming by the appropriate com-

mittees of the Congress. This means that any reprogramming will be reviewed by the space committee of the House and the space committee of the other body, as well as the Committees on Appropriations. We would again have an opportunity to look at any reprogramming problem.

Mr. Speaker, in our opinion, we feel we have brought back for the consideration

of the House a good conference report. All legislation, of course, represents compromise. We must, however, get on with the business of the Congress. We hope the conference report on the NASA appropriation bill will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks I include the following comparative statement on the bill as finally approved:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968, COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget estimate, 1968	Passed House, 1968	Passed Senate, 1968	Conference action, 1968	Conference compared with—			
						Appropriation, 1967	Budget, 1968	House, 1968	Senate, 1968
Research and development.....	4,245,000	4,352,000	3,899,500	3,995,500	3,925,000	-320,000	-427,000	+25,500	-70,500
Construction of facilities.....	83,000	76,700	35,900	55,400	35,900	-47,100	-40,800	-----	-19,500
Administrative operations.....	640,000	671,300	648,000	628,000	628,000	-12,000	-43,300	-20,000	-----
Total.....	4,968,000	5,100,000	4,583,400	4,678,900	4,588,900	-379,100	-511,100	+5,500	-90,000

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work which has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations as well as the other members of the committee of conference on the part of the House, who brought back this conference report.

I compliment them upon carrying out the will of this body.

However, insofar as reprogramming is concerned, do I understand that there must exist an emergency situation or, in other words, a "must" situation before the Administrator reprograms any of these funds in any one fiscal year? In other words, that we must seek the approval and the permission of the appropriate committees of both the House of Representatives and the other body, before undertaking this reprogramming?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Missouri is entirely correct in his former premise that he must submit reprogramming items to both the House of Representatives and to the other body and these must be approved by the appropriate committees of both bodies.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman will yield further, this is not one of those questions of a veto in reverse, wherein if the House of Representatives does not take action within so many days upon the reprogramming request that then it will take effect?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have one final question: Would this reprogramming be undertaken upon a line item appropriation basis?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes. The Administrator may reprogram for any matter that he deems is of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Of course; I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] whether, since he has discussed both conference reports, he in-

tends to consider them together? It is my understanding that we would consider the report on NASA first, dispose of it, and then consider the housing report separately.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from North Carolina is entirely correct. I gave some overall totals for the two bills to indicate the total reductions of \$1.2 billion. Then I tried to go particularly to the items in disagreement because we have recently concluded our recommendations thereon.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to make it perfectly clear to the Members of the House that we shall be voting, first, upon the NASA conference report; after which the other bill will be considered, the report on the housing section, or that portion of the independent offices appropriation bill which deals with model cities and rent supplements.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I concur in the view expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I would also comment to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], in response to his inquiry addressed to the gentleman from Tennessee, that in addition to the requirement that reprogramming has to be approved by the appropriate committees of the Congress—and these committees are the two authorizing committees and the two Committees on Appropriations—any reprogramming will have to be done within the total dollar limitation of the appropriation. So, it is a matter of reprogramming within the present program, rather than going outside of the program.

Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I would like to point out and to remind the Members of the House who are present here today that, with reference to the NASA funding item, we started out with a budget request of \$5,100 million.

The conference report before you today is \$511,100,000 below the budget; it is \$379,100,000 below the appropriation for 1967; it is \$90 million below the Senate-passed bill; and it is \$5.5 million above the House-passed bill.

The Senate-passed bill was \$95.5 million above the House, and as I said, the conference report contemplates an appropriation which will be only \$5.5 million above the House, and \$90 million below the Senate.

This amounts to a cut under the budg-

et of approximately 10 percent. We have been talking a lot recently about 5-percent cuts, and this one is double that, or 10 percent. Yet in the opinion of the members of the subcommittee who have heard the testimony and now agree in conference, the bill is adequate to take care of the needs of NASA during the next year, in view of the fiscal situation of our country. It is substantially lower than last year's appropriation; it is a substantial reduction under the budget; yet it nevertheless is a substantial appropriation—\$4,588,900,000.

The conference report outlines the actions taken in conference and I join the gentleman from Tennessee in recommending its approval by the House.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON].

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to compliment the conferees on what I know has been a difficult task. However, I want to express my personal opposition to the cuts that have been made in the NASA program. I believe the time will probably come when we are going to be faced with the same situation we were faced with when the Russian Sputnik first went up, and then we are going to be wondering why we did not go ahead with many of these very important space programs.

I recognize that restraint in spending is necessary. However, I do want to express my opposition to these cuts in the space program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman. These are important programs but it is necessary at this time to make some difficult decisions. We believe that some of the space programs must therefore be deferred for later consideration.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to find that the conferees on H.R. 12474, making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, have empha-

sized research and development for the science and space program.

The conferees also have emphasized the importance of reprogramming available funds by NASA under this budget. In fact, the statement of legislative intent specifically states the "understanding" that the Administrator may reprogram funds in "Research and development" for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interests of the United States, with approval of the appropriate committees of the Congress."

These interested committees are the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the respective appropriation committees of the House and Senate.

This is a direct invitation and really a request by the Congress that James Webb as Administrator of NASA take this responsibility of reprogramming and making his recommendations to the Congress according to current priorities as established by the President.

I firmly believe that it is in the U.S. national interest and of the highest priority in the U.S. space research and development program to proceed at once with the 200,000-pound-thrust NERVA II nuclear rocket engine development program. It is also of the highest priority that the United States continue in the U.S. planetary exploration program during the 1970 decade. This means that the Voyager Mars program must likewise be funded in this fiscal year by NASA in order to have the spacecraft ready for flight during favorable conjunctions of Mars and Earth in 1973 and 1975. These two programs are "musts" for U.S. preeminence, or even eminence, in future space explorations.

I have said repeatedly that since 1958 there has been a space propulsion gap between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. This gap is not yet closed and, in my judgment, is widening.

By July of 1968, I predict we will be sending congratulations to Russia for launching a rocket bigger than the U.S. Saturn V. Russia recognizes the importance of work on big boosters and high energy fuels and it is a tragic mistake for this country to drop out of the advanced propulsion program now. I have emphasized the importance of high energy fuel research in the United States on boron and fluorine base fuels for second stage rocket flight. Likewise, solid fuel rockets could be an important workhorse for U.S. space boosters which could help close the propulsion gap.

Today, Chinese research and development is directed toward competing with a space and nuclear rocket program of Chinese origin. Chinese work on advanced rocket technology will, sooner than most people think, see the beginning of a Chinese space program starting with a satellite by next January and their military rockets will soon become a threat to the entire Pacific area of the world. With China in the race for domination of space and the United States slowing its effort, we will move to a third position with tragic consequences.

Administrator Webb's forthcoming re-

programming testimony before Congress may be the most significant he will ever give if he emphasizes research and development programs rather than insisting on spending money for the manufacture and fabrication of existing rocket booster designs. If he wants to assure that the maximum options are available to the United States in the next decade, he will place greater emphasis on allocating funds to programs that will give us needed flexibility in space.

Specifically, the Voyager and NERVA II programs should be funded this fiscal year. Voyager is the only major planetary exploration program this Nation will have in the 1970's. If this program is abandoned, we will be abdicating our responsibilities for planetary exploration. This is particularly significant following the recent Russian Venus IV soft landing on the planet Venus.

The NERVA II program to develop a 200,000-pound-thrust nuclear rocket engine is NASA's only new engine development program which can significantly uprate the Saturn V rocket. Failure to provide funds for this program in fiscal 1968 will force the United States to continue flying outdated, obsolete, and more expensive liquid fuel upper stages in the 1970's and 1980's. Funds should also be made available to at least start early phases of the construction of two nuclear rocket test stands at the nuclear rocket development station in Nevada. This facility is required to test the advanced NERVA II engine.

Although insufficient funds have been made available to NASA for all the activities they want to support, NASA can take either or both of two alternatives to find money to support really essential programs. First, NASA can take steps to make necessary funds available by more efficient management of production of Saturn V vehicles.

Rescheduling of proposed production of Saturn V vehicles from the present plan of two per year in 1971 and 1972 and four per year in 1973 and 1974 by going to the more economical rate of six per year would mean production of 12 Saturn vehicles over 2 years rather than 4 years, could mean a savings of a half-billion dollars which could be made available for other programs which need money now. In addition, NASA could make additional funds available through more efficient use of Saturn IB vehicles which are in storage or in the process of being completed. NASA now has six of these expensive vehicles in storage and two more in the final stages of checkout. Yet, in spite of the tight money situation, NASA is going right ahead to spend money on long-lead-time items for more Saturn I vehicles. I have challenged NASA to submit a more economical reschedule of rocket procurements and have not yet heard what action they plan to take. Perhaps when Administrator Webb testifies before Congress as requested in the conference report, we can hear more about how he plans to economize and still conduct the necessary parts of a growing space program.

Second, Congress has always been receptive to requests for deficiency appropriations from NASA when such requests

become necessary due to changing conditions. If reprogramming fails to take care of all necessary program requirements and a deficiency exists, NASA can come back to Congress at a later time and make its needs known.

It is important for NASA to realize that Congress continues to support a strong space effort and, in spite of a tight money situation, we on the respective House and Senate Space Committees and the conference committee for NASA's fiscal year 1968 appropriation are confident that reprogramming of funds for research and development by the Administrator, to meet high priority demands, can be successfully accomplished in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the addition of funds in the report of the conference for the Apollo applications program. I regret the total could not be more. This is a vital part of our Nation's space effort because funds invested in this work assure the maximum benefits of the Apollo program and the continuation of the manned space flight program beyond the current schedule.

The recent Soviet achievement in the Venus exploration points up the need for our Nation to devote more effort to our own space program. I believe we should and must remain in the space competition not only for the enormous technological benefits which our own industry and people realize from the spinoff of these scientific endeavors but because of the prestige value of making clear our accomplishments of our society.

For this reason I regret the limited funding for the important post-Apollo programs such as the Voyager interplanetary exploration and the investigation of more efficient means of propulsion such as nuclear rockets.

It is some encouragement to note the statement of the House conferees regarding research and development funds:

The Administrator may reprogram funds in research and development for purposes he determines to be of higher priority and in the best interest of the United States, with the approval of the appropriate Committees of the Congress.

I am only too well aware of the austere budgetary situation facing this Nation today. But, I am also aware of the vast needs for increased investment in our country's future through the space exploration and scientific achievement.

It is essential that this program be continued to support the challenge and the promise in an orderly and productive manner.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report, and that I may include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 822)

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 67 of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) "making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$312,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
GORDON ALLOTT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 58: Authorizes \$100,000,000 for grants for urban renewal projects within model cities instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$312,000,000 for Model Cities Programs instead of \$237,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$537,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The total includes \$12,000,000 for planning grants, \$200,000,000 for model cities supplemental grants, and \$100,000,000 for urban renewal projects that are part of model cities programs.

Amendment No. 67: Deletes House language and inserts language as proposed by the Senate and authorizes \$10,000,000 contract authority for rent supplement payments instead of no amount as proposed by the House and \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JOE L. EVINS,
EDWARD P. BOLAND,
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
DAVID PRYOR,
GEORGE MAHON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
LOUIS C. WYMAN,
BURT L. TALCOTT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this conference report relates only to two items still in disagreement. These were debated and voted on just 2 days ago. These two are the only items in disagreement—one is the model cities program and the other is the rent supplement item of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for 1968.

All of the other items have been resolved and we went back to further conference on the two items to which I have referred.

There was very strong desire in the other body to insist on the full amount in the budget. We pointed out that the House had sustained the position taken by the House earlier. However, I think that we all recognized that we must finish this matter and get on with the business of the Congress and a final settlement was reached. We feel that it is a good settlement.

Mr. Speaker, the conference total for this bill is \$10,139,473,000 for some 20 independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The conference total is \$681,039,800 below the budget estimates.

The cuts and reductions are almost

\$700 million, which is a 6.3-percent cut below the budget.

Items numbered 58 and 59 both relate to the model cities program. Item 58 has to do with urban renewal projects within the model cities.

The House had provided \$75 million for this purpose and the other body \$125 million.

Your conferees felt that an increase for urban renewal was justified in view of the fact that the urban renewal features of the model cities program will probably move forward right away. The cities have long experience with urban renewal programs which they certainly will apply to parts of the model cities program.

In relation to planning grants, both the House and the Senate bills provide identical amounts. We are in agreement in providing \$12 million.

For model cities grants the budget amount was \$400 million. Your conferees have agreed to \$200 million instead of the \$150 million proposed by the House and the amount of \$400 million proposed by the Senate. The other body has therefore yielded to 80 percent of the difference and we have yielded only to 20 percent.

The conference report therefore includes \$12 million for planning grants, \$200 million for model cities supplementary grants, and \$100 million for urban renewal projects that are parts of model cities programs, or a total of \$312 million for all three parts of the model cities program.

The full budget amount, as you will recall, for these items was \$662,000,000. The conferees bring back to you the amount of \$312,000,000.

The only other item of difference between the two bodies is the amount of contract authority to be provided with respect to the rent supplement program. Last year the Congress provided \$20,000,000. This year, as you will recall, the House did not provide any funds, although the Committee on Appropriations had recommended \$10,000,000. The Senate insisted on the amount of \$40,000,000.

While I have supported the position of the House, it is clear that some funding must be provided if we are to have a bill. A compromise must be reached. All legislation is a compromise, Mr. Speaker, and we have reached a compromise at what I believe to be the minimum and very lowest figure.

The Congress is going to have to face up to the problems of the cities in the future. Only a month ago the life insurance companies, as you will recall, pledged \$1 billion for investment to improve housing conditions in slum areas and the ghettos of this Nation.

This is a very significant step forward. The industry is to be commended. However, the rent supplement program is crucial if the life insurance companies are to fulfill their commitment and make this private investment. This is the private enterprise approach to solving the problem of decent housing for people in low-income areas. It must receive the support of the Congress.

In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, and so as to take advantage of the pledge

and commitment made by the insurance companies—and to encourage other industries to help solve the problems of the slums in our cities in a realistic way through the private enterprise approach—we have agreed to this minimum amount for rent supplements. This will keep this new and experimental program going and alive so it can be further considered next year.

Mr. Speaker, these are the key items in this conference report for these independent offices and agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The other body has yielded on about 75 percent of the differences and the House has yielded to only about 25 percent.

The bill is more than \$681 million below the budget. The other body receded

to the extent of more than \$375 million. I feel that the conferees have done a good job and that the House has prevailed. We think that the conference report should be adopted.

I shall include a summary table on the bill in my remarks at this point and then, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina such time as he may require:

SUMMARY TABULATION, INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND HUD APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 9960)

	Appropriations, 1967	Budget estimates, 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference actions compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1967	Budget esti- mates, 1968	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I									
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	\$525,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	\$524,000	—\$1,000			
Office of Emergency Planning.....	10,300,000	7,025,000	9,645,000	9,685,000	9,645,000	—655,000	+\$2,620,000		—\$40,000
Office of Science and Technology.....	1,200,000	1,837,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	1,550,000	+\$350,000	—287,000	+\$100,000	—100,000
President's Commission on Postal Organi- zation.....		1,500,000		1,500,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	—500,000	+1,000,000	—500,000
Disaster relief.....	24,550,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	20,000,000	—4,550,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000	—5,000,000
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	75,700,000	63,066,000	61,400,000	61,566,000	61,483,000	—14,217,000	—1,583,000	+83,000	—83,000
Civil Service Commission.....	134,574,000	151,117,000	136,048,000	151,081,000	149,048,000	+14,474,000	—2,069,000	+13,000,000	—2,033,000
Commission on the Political Activity of Government Personnel.....	175,000			25,000	25,000	—150,000	+25,000	+25,000	
Federal Communications Commission.....	17,852,300	19,221,000	19,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000	+1,247,700	—121,000	+100,000	
Federal Power Commission.....	14,220,000	14,830,000	14,220,000	14,445,000	14,220,000		—610,000		—225,000
Federal Trade Commission.....	14,378,000	15,225,000	15,000,000	15,150,000	15,150,000	—772,000	—75,000	+150,000	
General Services Administration.....	642,831,000	567,979,700	548,913,900	568,907,900	559,484,900	—83,346,100	—8,494,800	+10,571,000	—9,423,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	28,479,000	23,784,000	23,400,000	23,530,000	23,460,000	—5,019,000	—324,000	+60,000	—70,000
National Science Foundation.....	479,999,000	526,000,000	495,000,000	505,000,000	495,000,000	+15,001,000	—31,000,000		—10,000,000
Renegotiation Board.....	2,537,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000		+63,000		
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	17,550,000	17,445,000	17,350,000	17,445,000	17,350,000		—95,000		—95,000
Selective Service System.....	58,940,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000	57,455,000		—1,485,000		
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	6,438,043,000	6,651,014,000	6,647,422,882	6,650,493,000	6,649,279,000	+211,236,000	—1,735,000	+1,856,118	—1,214,000
Civil Defense (DOD).....	101,100,000	111,000,000	86,100,000	91,100,000	86,100,000	—15,000,000	—24,900,000		—5,000,000
Emergency health activities (HEW).....	10,000,000	12,500,000	9,000,000	9,426,000	9,000,000	—1,000,000	—3,500,000		—426,000
Department of Housing and Urban Devel- opment.....	1,486,300,000	2,561,391,000	1,853,650,000	2,289,148,000	1,948,000,000	+461,700,000	—613,391,000	+94,350,000	—341,148,000
TITLE II									
CORPORATIONS									
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	(17,875,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(18,190,000)	(+315,000)			
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Cor- poration.....	(285,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(298,000)	(+13,000)			
Federal Housing Administration.....	(95,650,000)	(99,625,000)	(98,000,000)	(98,000,000)	(98,000,000)	(+2,350,000)	(+1,625,000)		
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(9,831,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(9,600,000)	(+331,000)			
Total appropriations.....	\$19,580,090,300	10,820,513,700	10,013,178,782	10,514,830,900	10,139,473,900	+559,383,600	—681,039,800	+126,295,118	—375,357,000

* Includes \$20,837,000 not in itemization above.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be kept in mind that we are not here today discussing an original bill. We are discussing a report that came out of conference. The conference report results from long and hard debate with the Members of the other body.

I have been around here a few years now, and if I have learned one thing it is that no one Member of this House, and neither House, can have its own way. We are part of the legislative branch of the Government which consists of two coordinate branches of equal dignity and responsibility.

We had some rollcalls in the House; the other body had some rollcalls also. When we went back to conference for the second time, we did so after two roll-call votes taken here the day before yesterday, which I would remind the Members did not specify that the House managers should adhere to the original House figures. Those votes were to reject the figures of the other body, and we succeeded in doing that in the conference.

The report we bring back to you indicates, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, that the House conferees won more points in this conference than our opposite numbers did, and I think that is quite clear from the record.

Let me remind you now that with re-

spect to model cities, we started off considering a budget estimate of \$662 million. The House committee recommended, and the House approved, \$237 million. The other body finally came out with a bill, adopted there on successive rollcalls over these key issues, which provided \$537 million—\$300 million higher than the House-passed bill.

The conference report includes \$312 million.

This means that the conference report is \$75 million above the original House bill but it is \$225 million below the bill passed in the other body. And even more significantly, I remind the Members here today, it is \$350 million below the budget.

When we sit down around the conference table with an opposite number or a friendly adversary to work out differences between two bills, it is just as if two people were sitting down together, a prospective purchaser and a prospective seller, to talk about a piece of property, and they are trying to get together at somewhere between what the seller proposes to take and the prospective buyer says he is willing to pay. That is exactly what we had to do in the conference.

I think the figures I have previously stated for the RECORD will indicate that

as a result of this conference, while we did not win all points and we did not sustain the original position of the House in toto, we are much closer to that position than the conference figures are to the figures adopted in the other body.

I am not entirely satisfied with this compromise, but I signed the conference report because I think it is the best compromise we could get. I think it is as close to the House figures as we could get in conference with the other body. The conferees on the other side were adamant and were prepared to spend more time in this conference than I think we can afford to spend because of the fact that we are now here in the closing days of October.

Something has to give. We have to move forward and make some progress or a stalemate will result. The fact that we are \$350 million in this one item below the budget, I think, is the significant point. I ask those who are for any reason not entirely satisfied with this conference report to remember that, because that is the significant point.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman very appropriately emphasizes the reductions which the con-

ference committee has made, and I think it is most worthy to point out that the full cuts are almost \$1,200,000,000. These are some of the biggest cuts that have been made in any appropriation bills this year. The 80-percent recision which the Senate has made indicates we have won substantial concessions from the other body, and they are to be commended for this in the current budgetary situation. The Senate has yielded to many of the House decisions.

Mr. JONAS. That is true. I concur in the view expressed by my friend from Tennessee.

I would like to comment now briefly on another part of this conference report we are now considering, and that is the rent supplements section, unless the gentleman from Missouri has a question about the demonstration or model cities.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I did have just one question. I appreciate, as I said before, the action of the managers on the part of the House in bringing this conference report back. My question, however, pertains to the gentleman's last statement before he goes to the rent supplement program.

Is it not true that in spite of what the gentleman states about the significant part being the dollar savings on the part of the managers for the House, the truly significant thing is that the oft pared and/or voted down and disapproved programs of a model demonstration cities and of rent supplements respectively still persist, albeit by a tenuous string, if we pass this conference report?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend from Missouri the model cities program has never been voted down in the House. We had a rollover on that in the original House-passed bill, but the position of the committee was sustained at \$237 million. That program has never, to my recollection, been rejected by the House. There has always been a question of how much money would be used to fund it.

May I say, before I leave the subject of model cities, I do not think this item, regardless of the amount, will have any impact on spending during the current fiscal year. This is all program grant money and they will not even be ready to allocate it until late next spring. It will probably be in the next fiscal year before any of this money will actually be disbursed, except the \$12 million that is in here for planning.

Now I believe I should make a few comments on the other part of this bill, which is the rent supplement provision. May I remind those who are present today that here again we need to remember what we started off considering.

First let me say that we already have a rent supplement program. It has already been funded at the rate of \$32 million. The Congress put \$12 million in the program in fiscal year 1966 to begin it. Last year the Congress put \$20 million in this program.

This year the administration asked for \$40 million, or to double the program. The conference report calls for \$10 million, which is one-half of the amount

appropriated last year and one-fourth of the amount requested. So the cut in this particular item is not 5 percent; it is a cut of 75 percent below the budget.

May I remind my colleagues also that when we got to conference we were faced with conferees from the other body who had instructions to insist on \$40 million of contract authority. We started off with zero.

There had to be a meeting of the minds somewhere between zero and \$40 million. One branch of the Congress cannot have its way when there are two coordinate branches. I believe we won the conference, since the funds recommended are 75 percent of these requested. The other body yielded three-fourths of its position and we yielded only one-fourth of ours.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman's point of view did win the conference and the funds for this program were cut drastically. As the gentleman pointed out to the House, the conferees agreed upon a cut in rent supplements of 75 percent below what was requested by the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. That is the reason why I have no difficulty supporting the conference report, although I have opposed this program, as is well known.

I wear two hats in a conference. Under one I proclaim my individual views. Under the other I am supposed to be working toward a compromise, trying to work out a settlement which is as close as possible to the House figure.

I believe we came as close to the House position as was possible. It is for this reason I support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield me another minute or two?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes, and thereafter I am going to move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe I should point out also that in the rent supplement settlement there are some restrictive provisions which were never before in this program, and which I believe will keep it from running away.

There is a provision inserted in the report of the other body which requires sponsors to put up 5 percent. I can assure the Members, from the mail I have received, many prospective sponsors do not like the idea of putting up any part of the cost.

It was the view of the conferees that any sponsor who wants to promote this program should have some equity in it, some of its own money involved. We think this will give some assurance that the program will be operated efficiently, economically, and satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker, there is another restrictive provision in the House report. I have reference to the requirement that this program be strictly financed through the private sector and without the use of the FNMA special assistance program. If they were permitted to use the special FNMA assistance program, it would be entirely

Government financed. We think it ought to be handled and financed through the private sector.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and in so doing want to express my commendation to our ranking minority member, the distinguished and capable gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], who at considerable personal sacrifice successfully fought the good fight for reasonable balance in this appropriation. I also wish to express admiration and regard for the efficient and expeditious handling of a complicated conference on the part of the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

In this conference report, we have settled on \$312 million for model cities and special urban renewal therein, and \$10 million for rent supplements. This compares with Senate recommendations of \$537 million and \$40 million. It is a good compromise and involves better than a 50-percent reduction in budget requests for the former and 75 percent for the latter.

I supported the model cities program in the initial House debates and do so again at this time because I believe this program is worth a try. Planning money in the requested amount of \$12 million was not in conference, having been agreed upon by both Houses. It will be a while before plans are completed, and HUD is ready to expend the funding for special urban renewal and supplementary grants within the model cities program. But this is 2-year money, and there will be a sufficient leadtime so that the money in the amount appropriated in this conference report can be adequately programmed and carefully expended.

There is no question about the need to do something within certain areas of our troubled cities. I am hopeful that the proposals will be effective. HUD will again appear before our Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee within the next 6 months with requests for funding for fiscal year 1969. At that time, it will be possible to review with somewhat greater detail the proposals and progress within this program. In this situation, I heartily recommend a favorable vote on this conference report.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I signed the conference report and urge approval by the House. Because I have opposed the rent subsidy and demonstration cities programs in the past, some explanation is necessary.

As a conferee of the House, I understand my responsibility to try to maintain the position of the House. I did this, but a deadlock with the other body ensued and it was necessary to resolve the differences. In a spirit of conscientiously trying to resolve differences of opinion, honestly held, I agreed with the other conferees to adjust certain line items throughout this important bill. More than 60 items in disagreement had to be resolved. I believe we have resolved them satisfactorily for now. Nevertheless, many of the items require continued study and evaluation and regular review in future appropriations and legislative committee hearings.

The rent subsidy program, in my opinion, is one of the least meritorious programs of this administration. It is deleterious to the American dream of homeownership.

Admittedly, we need to improve the housing in the United States, especially the housing of the poor. But it should not be forgotten that housing in America is the envy of the world. No country in the history of mankind has been housed as well as in the United States. The poor of our country are housed better than the elite of most other countries.

The unique superior housing situation in the United States has been due almost entirely to individual effort, personal pride, family ambition, free enterprise, and the dream of homeownership—not to bureaucracy and not to Federal assistance.

Areas where the homes are owned excel areas where homes are rented in every good aspect of community living. Delinquency, crime, squalor, disease, and costs of government service are greater in districts of home tenancy than in districts of homeownership. There is a real and sociological correlation.

We in the Federal Government should be promoting homeownership and not home tenancy. The Federal programs for homeownership have been far more successful and less expensive. Every program of Federal tenancy has failed or is failing.

Every penny we put into a Federal subsidy for tenancy is money lost to another program doomed to failure, a program counterproductive to the American dream, and a deferment—financially and philosophically—of a program of homeownership.

I have watched and studied the rental subsidy program from the beginnings. I served on the legislative committee and observed the administration force the program through the committee and the Congress without adequate consideration, without considering the consequences—just to have another political ornament to try to impress the poor and to develop another Federal bureaucracy.

Rent subsidies was simply a misapprehension to attract favorable and sympathetic attention—and votes. It was not primarily a housing program—as I have said, American housing, even for the poor, was, and is, preeminent. There were other better housing programs and ideas.

Rent subsidies is still not a housing program—its principal objective is inte-

gration, not housing. Social, economic, and racial integration is the basic aim.

If housing were the objective, the program would be placed under the jurisdiction or management of housing experts. Almost the exact opposite is the case. Churches and labor unions are to be the operators of the rent subsidy programs. Churches have demonstrated practically no ability to operate housing developments. Their expertise is in other important sociological fields, but not housing. The history of labor union management of housing has been one of insolvency or mismanagement. Labor unions have vast sums of surplus moneys to invest. Housing would be a proper place for investment, but housing management is not their forte.

Housing, especially housing for the poor and for large families, requires a special expertise which the churches and unions do not have. They would not survive in this field without subsidization of their inefficiencies, waste, and mismanagement—for 40 years—by the Federal taxpayer.

Housing should be left to housing experts. If the Federal taxpayer is to subsidize any group, it should not be the churches or the unions. Most churches and unions recognize and admit this shortly after their first venture into the low rental housing business.

There are many better programs for housing. Rent certificates are better in every aspect. So long as we continue to force rent supplements there will be little chance for rent certificates or homeownership programs.

I trust that my agreement with the conferees regarding a \$15 million appropriation for rent subsidies will not be construed as accepting the tenancy subsidy program as the final answer. We have an obligation to the poor, to those inadequately housed, and to the taxpayer to do better. We must develop a superior program. We must emphasize homeownership and not tenancy. We must not expect a housing program to accomplish the social, economic, and racial goals of integration.

The demonstration cities is a more honest program. Its objectives to improve the American city are admirable. The Federal Government has a very real and considerable obligation in this field.

But again the program was hastily concocted, politically conceived, inadequately studied, carelessly planned, misrepresented, and simply wrong in many aspects.

I oppose the basic idea of Federal cities. I believe most cities can manage themselves better than the Secretary of the Federal Housing and Urban Development Department. But this is not the real issue here.

We have already appropriated more money to HUD than HUD can spend. Not a single plan has been selected for which planning money can be granted as yet. I have favored the appropriation of planning money consistently. No new idea has ever originated from HUD, but some planning money could probably be used beneficially by the cities.

There is an even more basic considera-

tion that HUD and the Congress is overlooking, which I want to reiterate.

The theory of demonstration cities is that Federal money poured into our deteriorating cities, and managed from Washington, can cure the ills that beset our cities. It is preached to us, that without Federal money and Federal programs we will have riots, juvenile delinquency, crime, disease, unemployment, ignorance, and racial prejudice. We may be deluding ourselves at great cost.

I am agreeing to appropriate funds to a project which has not proved itself to give it a chance. Perhaps we can learn from this experiment. I hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, however, that the principal reason for the riots, looting, arson, sniping, and anarchy is not unemployment, ignorance, poor housing, or racial prejudice. If by some great miracle, the greatest ever—ignorance, poverty, racial prejudice, unemployment, and poor housing—could be eliminated in one fell swoop overnight, we would still have the riots and city problems.

We are overlooking another important cause of the breakdown of our cities, even though I do not suggest that programs for housing, education, training, and citizenship should not be pursued by all segments of our society.

City or community management is a tough business requiring extraordinary expertise, experience, dedication, and cooperation by every individual in the city, neighborhood, or community.

It is easier to manage a business of 10,000 employees than a community of 10,000 souls. Good and bad communities and towns do not just happen by accident. For a city to be good, its citizens must contribute more than they take out or consume.

The success and progress of a city, large or small, or of a neighborhood, does not depend solely upon the mayor or city council. Good city management requires good officials, good city employees, good volunteer officials and workers, good institutions, good citizens. All must have a special competence and a dedicated concern.

The major trouble with our riot-torn, and our riot-prone, cities is that the competent and concerned citizens have moved to the suburbs, leaving the incompetent and the unconcerned to manage the cities and the neighborhoods.

Washington, D.C., is not untypical. The truly competent and concerned people have moved to the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. Those who have the ability, training, and experience necessary for leadership in government, business, industry, voluntary charities, and public service have moved out. The ordinary citizen with the interest and concern to be a good contributing, productive citizen—the citizen who will manage his family, keep up his yard, take pride in his schools and streets—has moved out in droves.

The people who once built Washington into a beautiful, progressive city were no longer willing to carry the burden for many who were unwilling to contribute their share.

With the exodus of the competent and concerned leaders and citizens, the core

areas were left with residents mostly incompetent, inexperienced, untrained, and unconcerned with city or community affairs and management. These people are unable to manage their families, their homes, their jobs or businesses, and, especially, not able to manage a community.

Additionally, into the core areas of our great cities have poured many persons from rural areas who are even less competent, experienced, or concerned with community affairs—and almost totally unable to assume positions of leadership in any sphere of community or city life and, regrettably, unable and unwilling to even contribute their share as ordinary citizens.

Education is probably the most crucial unfilled need, the most urgent unachieved national goal, today. Demonstration cities does not reach either of these two basic troubles of our deteriorating cities. We are being fooled and misled if we buy this expensive, unproductive program without thorough scrutiny, review, and revision.

I hope I have made myself clear. That we should do something to help our cities out of their deterioration. Federal proposals may not be the final answer to all the city problems. Federal money is not a cureall. The demonstration cities program has serious deficiencies and is misdirected. We must improve the Federal role. We can. This will require cooperation by every Member.

The proposed conference report can be adopted, the appropriations for rent subsidies and demonstration cities can be approved to maintain such a spirit of cooperation and to permit other important, successful, ongoing Federal programs to continue without interruption.

Each of us, opponents and proponents, have an obligation to carefully scrutinize these new programs, to improve them and to try to accomplish their admirable objectives in the best possible way. By approving this conference report we are not abandoning our search for better ways to provide better housing and to improve our cities—we are demonstrating a willingness to cooperate.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this conference report deals with the two items that were in disagreement between the House and Senate conferees. Those items are the model cities program and the rent supplement program. In the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Appropriations Committee, I supported the full budget request submitted by the President and concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget and the Housing and Urban Development Department. That amounted to \$662 million—\$12 million for planning grants, \$200 million for add-on urban renewal projects in model cities areas and \$400 million for supplementary grants in the model cities program. My position did not prevail and the committee's recommendation of \$237 million was adopted by the House for the model cities program. The Senate voted \$537 million for this program. The conferees finally agreed to \$312 million.

Mr. Speaker, my own judgment on this action is that the cities have been short-changed. With all of the promise that

the model cities program offers to lift the crushing burdens from the core cities of this Nation—together with a real opportunity for these cities to develop some new and challenging programs in the ghettos of the Nation's cities, by this drastic reduction in funding the program, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are offering "pie in the sky" but little solid food on the table.

However, Mr. Speaker, I have served on enough conferences to know that constant disagreement creates a stalemate and the entire program in which one deeply believes and supports becomes endangered. In order to get a bill at all, it was necessary to come to some adjustment. I do not like the agreement and I did offer suggestions in the conference that would have greatly increased the amount that was brought back to the House. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report. The funds provided will enable the Housing and Urban Development Department to advance beyond the planning stage in model cities program.

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment affecting the rent supplement, I too, supported the original budget request of \$40 million. In our own House subcommittee, the majority favored \$10 million but this item was deleted when the bill came to the floor of the House. The Senate restored the entire amount of \$40 million. Efforts were made at my suggestion in the conference to come to an agreement of \$20 million. No agreement could be reached on this amount and finally a compromise of \$10 million was struck. On this basis, I favor the recommendation of the conferees.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the model cities program is one of the most important programs yet conceived to meet the problems of bad housing, slum neighborhoods, unemployment, and all of the things that go into the cloud of hopelessness which hangs over slum areas. At last we have a program designed to put into effect the long-sought goal of a comprehensive attack on the problems of low-income families. Controversial as it is today, I believe that the logic of this approach will prove itself and this kind of coordination of programs will become the pattern, not the exception, of future legislation.

The urgent question before the House today is whether or not we will make a start on this new approach. Every Member of this House is deeply aware of the problems confronting our towns and cities of every size. It is deeply regrettable that we cannot get the full dollar authorization provided in the 1966 act but the important thing right now is to appropriate these funds and make a start on this critically needed new approach to urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, may I also say that the conferees deserve the highest commendation for their hard and sincere work on the many difficult and important provisions in this appropriation bill. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I know the complications and controversy involved in our programs and of course this bill deals with many other programs as well.

It is vital that we support the provision authorizing an additional \$10 million in rent supplement contract authority to maintain the momentum of that most promising program. Those of us who have always supported this program deeply regret that we cannot attain the full \$40 million requested in the budget. However, it would be a tragedy if we were to lose even the modest amount proposed here. It would be deeply discouraging to the many nonprofit sponsors who are now developing this kind of housing and most importantly, it would be a bitter disappointment to the low-income families who need this housing. To these impoverished people, it would mean that this great House of Representatives has turned its back on their needs and condemned them to continue living in slum housing.

It is deeply satisfying to note that some who originally opposed the concept of privately sponsored, privately operated, privately financed housing for low-income families have studied it further and swung around to favor it. The true measure of a man is his willingness to consider facts in depth and be willing to change his mind when he feels that is the proper course. We welcome their vitally needed support and I hope that the House will approve this provision today by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring my views on the model cities and rent supplement programs now presented as amendments to the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill before this committee.

Surely, no Member on either side of the House can say that urban problems of decent housing and city planning are not problems which deserve the attention of the Congress. The problems of this Nation's poor in both urban and rural areas are problems which can be solved with vision and planning expressed in programs of permanent and long-range benefit.

The administration has tried to prove that it can fight a large-scale war, continue foreign aid, and at the same time advance the Great Society. The impending \$29 billion deficit and the request for a 10-percent surtax is stark admission that this plan was overly ambitious and has failed. The simple truth is that we cannot afford to be everything at once.

The programs of rent subsidy and model cities are experimental ventures which will require larger sums from now on, if adopted. I am not against experiment, but we must face the fact that we cannot now afford it. For these reasons I will vote to recommit the bill to bring it back to its original cost level as passed by the House, and I will vote against its final passage in its present inflated state.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this House is being asked to fund the rent supplement program with a sum of money that is ridiculous. The \$10 million approved by the conferees will not even scratch the surface of the problem—decent housing for all people.

I have no alternative but to support this appropriation, but I do so knowing full well that this is not enough. Our colleagues in the Senate approved \$40 million for the program and we all know

that even that is not enough to make a real difference. The Full Opportunity Act which I recently introduced would provide \$250 million per year for rent supplements. This amount would furnish funds for a meaningful effort. I wish that we could stand today and be counted in favor of such a significant effort to abolish substandard housing. Instead, we are in the unenviable position of fighting just to keep this program alive.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we denying this program adequate funds? Why, are we denying the needy, the elderly, the handicapped, the opportunity to live decently? Why are we denying private sponsors, builders, and lending institutions the chance to help their neighbors?

At the present time there is a backlog of applications for 15,352 rent supplement units. The amount needed just to cover these applications is \$13.5 million. Are we so callous that we can turn our backs on the families that will not be able to live decently because we would not fund this program adequately?

Is there any among us who can turn to these in the slums, the ghettos, the tenements, the shacks, and say I would not help you? Are there those here who care only for the affluent?

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that our friends in the Senate have a good deal more foresight. For the Members of that august body remember Newark and Detroit, Plainfield and Cambridge, Watts and Harlem—and they, in adequately funding the rent supplement program, were looking ahead to the day that one of the burning problems in those cities, and in cities everywhere, would be solved; namely, decent housing for all Americans.

Rent supplements provide the hope and encouragement to people that is needed for them to better their own lives. The program expresses the aspirations that we as a people have for all our fellow men.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will soon have another opportunity to fulfill our deep responsibility to all the people of this Nation. Congress must not keep its back turned on needy Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the conference report at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. FINO. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINO moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 9960 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers

on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 67.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, is the vote on the motion to recommit, with instructions, concerned with amendment No. 67 and the position of the House with reference to the rent supplement program? It is my opinion that the Members of the House have a right to know upon what they are voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri in response to his parliamentary inquiry that the gentleman will have to refer to the conference report in answer to his parliamentary inquiry.

The question was taken.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 198, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—184

Abbitt	Davis, Wis.	Kleppe
Abernethy	Denney	Kornegay
Adair	Derwinski	Kuykendall
Anderson, Ill.	Devine	Laird
Andrews, Ala.	Dole	Langen
Andrews,	Dorn	Latta
N. Dak.	Dowdy	Lennon
Arends	Duncan	Lipscomb
Ashbrook	Edwards, Ala.	Lloyd
Baring	Erlenborn	Lukens
Bates	Eshleman	McClary
Battin	Findley	McClure
Belcher	Fino	McCulloch
Bennett	Flynt	McDade
Berry	Ford, Gerald R.	McEwen
Betts	Frelinghuysen	McMillan
Bevill	Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard
Blester	Galifianakis	Mathias, Calif.
Blackburn	Gardner	May
Bow	Gathings	Mayne
Bray	Gettys	Meskill
Brinkley	Goodell	Michel
Brock	Goodling	Miller, Ohio
Brotzman	Gross	Montgomery
Brown, Ohio	Grover	Moore
Broyhill, N.C.	Gubser	Myers
Broyhill, Va.	Gurney	Nelsen
Buchanan	Hagan	Nichols
Burke, Fla.	Haley	O'Konski
Bush	Hall	O'Neal, Ga.
Byrnes, Wis.	Halleck	Passman
Cahill	Hammer-	Pettis
Carter	schmidt	Pike
Cederberg	Hansen, Idaho	Pirnie
Chamberlain	Harrison	Poff
Clancy	Harsha	Pool
Clausen,	Henderson	Price, Tex.
Don H.	Hosmer	Quile
Clawson, Del.	Hull	Quillen
Cleveland	Hunt	Rallsback
Collier	Hutchinson	Randall
Colmer	Ichord	Reid, Ill.
Conable	Jarman	Reifel
Cramer	Johnson, Pa.	Reinecke
Cunningham	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis	Keith	Riegle
Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Rivers

Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherie
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz

Smith, Calif.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tunney
Waggoner
Wampler

Watkins
Watson
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wylder
Wylie
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—198

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson,
Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ayres
Barrett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Casey
Celler
Clark
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Ellberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giammo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths

Gude
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeyer
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrums
Leggett
Long, Md.
McDonald,
Mich.
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger

Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Foage
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Shipley
Shriver
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walde
Walker
Watts
Whalen
Widnall
Wilson
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

NOT VOTING—50

Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Boggs
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Carey
Cohelan
Corman
Dawson
Dickinson
Diggs
Everett
Farbstein
Feighan
Fisher

Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Fuqua
Gray
Halpern
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Jones, Mo.
Kirwan
Kyl
Long, La.
McCarthy
McFall

Madden
Martin
Miller, Calif.
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Pollock
Rarick
Resnick
Ruppe
St. Onge
Sandman
Stuckey
Tenzer
Utt
Williams, Miss.
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. St. Onge against.
Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Utt for, with Mr. Feighan against.
Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Kirwan against.
Mr. Burton of Utah for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Halpern against.

Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Tenzer against.

Mr. Ashmore for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Hanna against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Cohelan against.

Mr. Stuckey for, with Mr. Farbstain against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Sandman for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Foley for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Gray with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Willis with Mr. William D. Ford.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 88, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

YEAS—297

Adair	Cederberg	Fino
Adams	Celler	Flood
Addabbo	Clark	Flynt
Albert	Clausen	Foley
Anderson, Ill.	Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.
Anderson, Tenn.	Clawson, Del	Fraser
Andrews, Ala.	Cleveland	Frelinghuysen
Andrews,	Collier	Friedel
N. Dak.	Conable	Fulton, Pa.
Annunzio	Conte	Fulton, Tenn.
Arends	Conyers	Gallifanakis
Ashley	Corbett	Gallagher
Ayres	Cowger	Gialmo
Barrett	Cramer	Gibbons
Bates	Culver	Gilbert
Battin	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Becher	Daddario	Green, Oreg.
Berry	Daniels	Green, Pa.
Bevill	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Blester	de la Garza	Grover
Bingham	Delaney	Gude
Blackburn	Dellenback	Hamilton
Blanton	Denney	Hammer
Blatnik	Dent	schmidt
Boland	Derwinski	Hanley
Bolling	Dingell	Hansen, Wash.
Bolton	Donohue	Hardy
Bow	Dow	Harsha
Brademas	Dowdy	Harvey
Brasco	Dulski	Hathaway
Brinkley	Duncan	Hays
Brooks	Dwyer	Heckler, W. Va.
Brotzman	Eckhardt	Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Helstoski
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Calif.	Hicks
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, La.	Hollifield
Burton, Calif.	Ellberg	Holland
Bush	Erlenborn	Horton
Button	Esch	Hosmer
Byrne, Pa.	Eshleman	Howard
Byrnes, Wis.	Evans, Colo.	Hull
Cabell	Evins, Tenn.	Hungate
Cahill	Fallon	Hunt
Carey	Farbstain	Ichord
Carter	Fascell	Irwin
Casey	Feighan	Jacobs
	Findley	Jarman

Joelson	Mosher	Scheuer
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Schweiker
Johnson, Pa.	Multer	Schwengel
Jonas	Murphy, Ill.	Scott
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Selden
Karsten	Nedzi	Shipley
Karh	Nichols	Shriver
Kastenmeier	Nix	Sisk
Kazen	O'Hara, Ill.	Slack
Kee	Olsen	Smith, Calif.
Keith	O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Kelly	Ottenger	Smith, N.Y.
King, Calif.	Patman	Smith, Okla.
Kirwan	Patten	Springer
Kleppe	Pelly	Stafford
Kluczynski	Pepper	Staggers
Kornegay	Perkins	Stanton
Kupferman	Pettis	Steed
Kyros	Philbin	Stephens
Laird	Pickle	Stratton
Landrum	Pike	Stubblefield
Leggett	Pirnie	Sullivan
Lloyd	Poage	Taft
Long, Md.	Poff	Talcott
McCarthy	Price, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
McDade	Pryor	Thompson, Ga.
McDonald, Mich.	Pucinski	Tiernan
McEwen	Purcell	Tunney
Macdonald, Mass.	Railsback	Ullman
MacGregor	Randall	Van Deerlin
Machen	Rees	Vander Jagt
Madden	Reid, Ill.	Vanik
Mahon	Reid, N.Y.	Vigorito
Mailliard	Reifel	Waggonner
Marsh	Reinecke	Waldie
Mathias, Calif.	Resnick	Walker
Mathias, Md.	Reuss	Wampler
Matsunaga	Rhodes, Pa.	Whalen
May	Riegle	Whidall
Mayne	Roberts	Wiggins
Meeds	Robison	Williams, Pa.
Meekill	Rodino	Wilson,
Michel	Rogers, Colo.	Charles H.
Minish	Ronan	Wolf
Mink	Rooney, N.Y.	Wright
Minshall	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
Mize	Rosenthal	Wylder
Monagan	Rostenkowski	Wyllie
Moore	Roush	Wyman
Moorhead	Roybal	Yates
Morgan	Rumsfeld	Young
Morris, N. Mex.	Ryan	Zablocki
Morse, Mass.	St Germain	Zwach
	Satterfield	
	Saylor	

NAYS—88

Abbit	Gurney	Price, Tex.
Abernethy	Hagan	Quile
Ashbrook	Haley	Quillen
Baring	Hall	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett	Halleck	Rivers
Betts	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Harrison	Roth
Brook	Henderson	Roudebush
Broyhill, N.C.	Hutchinson	Schadegberg
Broyhill, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Buchanan	King, N.Y.	Schneebeli
Burke, Fla.	Kuykendall	Sikes
Burleson	Langen	Skubitz
Burton, Utah	Latta	Snyder
Chamberlain	Lennon	Steiger, Ariz.
Clancy	Lipscumb	Steiger, Wis.
Colmer	Lukens	Taylor
Curtis	McClary	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Wis.	McClure	Thomson, Wis.
Devine	McCulloch	Watkins
Dole	McMillan	Watson
Dorn	Miller, Ohio	Watts
Edwards, Ala.	Mills	Whalley
Gardner	Montgomery	White
Gathings	Myers	Whitener
Gettys	Nelsen	Whitten
Goodell	O'Konski	Winn
Goodling	O'Neal, Ga.	Zion
Gross	Passman	
Gubser	Pool	

NOT VOTING—47

Ashmore	Fountain	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspinall	Fuqua	O'Hara, Mich.
Bell	Garmatz	Pollock
Boggs	Gray	Rarick
Broomfield	Halpern	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Sandman
Cohelan	Hawkins	St. Onge
Corman	Hébert	Stuckey
Dawson	Herlong	Tenzer
Dickinson	Honors, Mo.	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	Kyl	Tuck
Downing	Long, La.	Udall
Everett	McFall	Utt
Fisher	Martin	Williams, Miss.
Ford	Miller, Calif.	Willis
William D.	Morton	Wilson, Bob

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Ashmore.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Olsen with Hawkins.

Mr. Tuck with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Downing.

Messrs. BRAY and HUTCHINSON

changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

by the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and it passed the House by a great majority, but it was not considered in the Senate. This year the bill was again approved by the Committee on Armed Services by a unanimous vote, and it has now been acted on by the Senate. However, with a reduction in the authorization by \$7.5 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I take it the bill was not considered in the other body under suspension of the rules, so that Members of the Senate had an opportunity to amend the bill, and practice a little economy on this giveaway to the Ryukyus.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The bill was amended in the Senate committee, and passed in the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever the procedure, they were not called upon to deal with a bill under suspension of the rules, therefore anyone interested in economy could get at this bill. That was the situation, was it not?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. It passed by unanimous consent of the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea as to whether there was any discussion—and I am pleased that the other body has become the economy body in this instance—but was there a discussion in the Senate with regard to this bill as to the buildup of capital improvements that may within the foreseeable future be taken over by the Japanese if and when the Ryukyu Islands revert to Japanese domination?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. This particular bill is not related to any capital improvements of the nature the gentleman has been talking about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the next

order of business will be the military pay bill that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina is ready to call up now. We will follow that with a conference report on the HEW appropriation bill which, I understand, has been agreed to. That will be followed by a conference report on the redistricting bill.

As far as I know that is all the business for today, and I have no announcement to make beyond what has already been programmed with reference to tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, we have the joint session with the President of the Republic of Mexico for tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With reference to the conference report on HEW, I believe the minority leader would like to know that we expect that will take only a few minutes under the circumstances of the agreement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From what I hear the House should applaud the fine action of the conferees on behalf of the HEW and Labor appropriation bill.

Mr. FLOOD. They did an excellent job.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I clarify one other thing? It is my understanding that the bill on extra-long-staple cotton, which we did not conclude yesterday, will be put over until next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. It will be put over until next week.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that I do not believe there will be a great deal of controversy on the conference report on HEW because the conference report carries out the instructions that were given to the conferees by the full House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am still unclear as to when the conference report on HEW may be expected. Today or tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. Today. We expect it will be ready by the time the military pay bill is disposed of; if not, then some time later this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

UNIFORMED SERVICE PAY ACT OF 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 13510, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, on October 17, 1967, all 40 members of the Committee on Armed Services unanimously approved a proposed pay increase for our uniformed services personnel.

The pay proposal embodied in H.R. 13510 as reported by the committee implements the recommendations of the President of the United States as provided the Congress on April 5, 1967.

As the Members of this body will recall, the President emphasized the necessity for an immediate adjustment in the compensation of the men and women of our uniformed services so as to "assure them and their families that they will be compensated for their service on a scale which is comparable to that of their 2.5 million civilian coworkers."

The President's message also raised the specter of inflation and therefore urged restraint in all sectors of our economy in establishing wage adjustments.

In view of these circumstances, the committee accepted the President's recommendation for a 5-percent increase in the compensation of our uniformed services personnel effective October 1, 1967.

Lest I be misunderstood, the endorsement of this 4.5-percent increase in military compensation should not be construed as precluding the necessity for further adjustments in military pay in the near future.

The 4.5-percent increase in military pay recommended in this legislation, in a very true sense, simply insures that the "real" pay of our service personnel will not slip behind the level of pay provided them in July of last year.

As you will recall, the Congress provided our service personnel with their last pay adjustment on July 1 of last year. However, since that date the Consumer Price Index has increased approximately 4.2 index points, or 3.7 percent of the July 1966 base. Therefore, you can see that this increase of 4.5 percent being recommended today simply permits these service families to keep even with the board. It certainly does not provide them with any significant increase in their pay.

In approving this pay increase for our service personnel, the committee was not unmindful of the fact that Federal employees are scheduled to receive additional automatic increases in their pay on July 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969.

Therefore, since the committee is determined that pay of our service personnel will continue its present relation-

ship to that of their classified Federal contemporaries, there has been included in this bill a provision that, in the event these second- and third-stage increases for Federal employees actually become effective, there will be—in the absence of intervening action by the Congress—comparable automatic increases for our service personnel.

Simple equity demands that we take such action. I am certain that every Member of this body wholeheartedly endorses this principle.

I will now briefly review each of the eight significant changes in the law proposed in this bill.

1. BASIC PAY INCREASE

As I had previously indicated, this bill increases the rates of basic monthly pay of our uniformed services personnel to provide a net 4.5-percent increase in their regular compensation.

Since "regular military compensation" includes basic pay, quarters, and subsistence allowances, either in cash or in kind, and the tax advantage thereon, it equates to the gross salaries payable to Federal employees under the Classification Act. Therefore, because regular military compensation includes elements other than basic pay, a 4.5-percent increase in "regular compensation" translates into a 5.6-percent increase in basic pay.

The manner in which this increase is computed is set out in considerable detail in the committee report.

2. DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT INCREASES

The bill increases the financial assistance allowances provided enlisted personnel with dependents in the lowest pay grades—that is, pay grades E-1 through E-4 with less than 4 years of service—recruit through corporal-petty officer third class. The proposed increases which would affect an estimated 270,000 personnel in the lowest four enlisted grades provide a monthly dollar increase of \$5 to \$7.50 per eligible member.

3. BACHELOR ALLOWANCES

The bill provides authority to permit the payment of basic allowances for quarters and the dislocation allowance to career bachelor personnel—without dependents—during a permanent change of station. This change would eliminate an inequity in existing law which now flatly denies these personnel entitlement to allowances which are primarily designed to reimburse personnel for expenses experienced upon permanent change of station.

4. SENIOR NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER POSITION

The bill provides a special basic pay rate for the senior noncommissioned officer position of each military service of \$844.20 per month. This is \$150 per month more than the highest enlisted basic pay otherwise proposed.

The cost is negligible—only four of these positions exist.

5. CONTINUATION PAY

The bill provides new authority to the departments for the payment of so-called continuation pay. This pay would be utilized in the form of a bonus and as a management tool to insure the retention of physicians and dentists of the

uniformed services beyond their obligated periods of service.

The legislation authorizes a maximum continuation-pay bonus calculated by multiplying the number of years of estimated additional service times a multiple of 1 to 4 months' basic pay. This management tool is completely permissive in nature and will be offered only to those physicians and dentists who are in critical skill categories.

6. RETIRED PAY ADJUSTMENT FORMULA

The bill also includes a departmental recommendation for refining the existing statutory formula which provides automatic retired pay increases based upon changes in the Consumer Price Index. The formula refinement is admittedly quite technical, but stated as simply as possible, it will tie the annuities of all retired personnel to the same base date for all future CPI adjustments and thus assure equitable treatment for all retirees with respect to CPI movements, regardless of when they retire.

Included in this change is a one-time catchup adjustment for individuals retired subsequent to November 30, 1966, and before October 1, 1967, the proposed effective date of this bill.

This one-time CPI adjustment of 3.7 percent to retired pay would affect an estimated 55,000 retirees with an initial estimated cost of \$6.5 million in fiscal year 1968. This cost will decline each year thereafter as mortality reduces the numbers in this group of retirees.

7. PERSONNEL RETIRED PRIOR TO OCTOBER 1, 1949

The bill also would eliminate an unintentional inequity in respect to a group of military retirees who retired prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. In enacting the Career Compensation Act of 1949 the Congress apparently inadvertently failed to permit a small group of retirees the right extended to their contemporaries who retired after October 1, 1949, to include inactive reserve service in their retirement multiple. This omission will be corrected by this legislation.

The Department advises that it supports this change but in view of the small number of personnel affected does not believe that this change will result in any significant increase in retired pay appropriations.

8. FUTURE ADJUSTMENTS IN UNIFORMED SERVICE PAY

As I had previously mentioned, the committee added another provision to this legislation relating to possible future adjustments in uniformed services pay. This provision, which appears as section 9 of the bill, is explained in great detail in the committee report.

This provision is simply "insurance" that service pay will continue to remain comparable to that provided our Federal classified employees. Failure of the committee to include such language would seriously endanger the comparability principle.

This provision, as contained in section 9 of the bill, may or may not cost any money. It all depends on what action Congress finally takes in respect to the second- and third-stage increases planned for classified employees. In the

event classified employees receive a second stage increase of 4.4 percent on July 1, 1968, and a third-stage increase of 7.4 percent on April 1, 1969, there will occur an equivalent increase in service pay. This equivalent increase in service pay in fiscal year 1970—July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970—will cost \$2.7 billion.

On the other hand, if the second- and third-stage increases for classified employees do not materialize, section 9 of the bill will not result in any additional increases in service pay and therefore will not result in any increased costs.

SUMMARY

Enactment of this proposal together with the adjustments previously made to the ration allowance of service personnel—increased from \$1.13 to \$1.30 per day—represents a net increase in compensation for uniformed services personnel for fiscal year 1968 of approximately \$633 million—Department of Defense revised figure.

I am advised that the Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1968 has already included \$77.2 million of this cost. Thus, there remains a net unfunded cost of approximately \$555 million, which will require a supplementary appropriation.

I am also advised that although the President's fiscal year 1968 budget did include a specific allowance of \$1 billion for a civilian and military pay increase, this total allowance was not identified as to particular programs or executive departments and has not appeared in any individual department's budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1968.

Stated another way, the proposed service pay increase will utilize approximately half of the budgetary amount included by the President in his fiscal year 1968 budget for Federal salary increases and will be the subject of a supplemental appropriation request to the Congress for fiscal year 1968.

That completes my summary of the bill and I would be delighted to attempt to answer any questions which might occur to the Members at this time.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. First, I wish to commend the gentleman from the well and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for their leadership, and all the members of the committee for their hard work in presenting this acceptable bill to the Committee and to the Congress.

I have had some concern personally, and I am sure many other Members have had concern, about the lack of adequate provision for widows of armed services personnel.

It is my understanding, I say to the gentleman, that under sections 410 and 411 of title 38 of the Veterans Benefit Code, some 10 years ago it was provided that the formula would be based on an amount of \$120 a month plus 12 percent of the service member's basic pay.

With the increments which are going to the servicemen, properly based upon the increase in cost of living and the change in the dollar value, it does seem

to me that all we are doing for the widows in this particular bill is giving them 12 percent of a 5.6-percent increase. This it seems to me does not provide for the widows of the armed services personnel the necessary funds to take care of themselves in this day and age of increased costs.

Recognizing as I do the concern which the gentleman in the well always has not only for armed services personnel but also for their families, I wonder if he can tell me what if anything has been done by this committee or by any other committee for the purpose of considering an adequate increase, a cost-of-living increase based upon the inflation we are experiencing today for widows and dependents of armed services personnel.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer as quickly as I can. First, I agree with the gentleman. I do not believe it is adequate.

That jurisdiction comes under the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] assured me he will have hearings on it. He will begin on Tuesday. I spoke with him today.

I agree with the gentleman. I have run a little test on what the gentleman just said. This roughly comes out a little over 1 percent, so they do not get a sufficient increase. They get a very little bit, about \$6 a month for some. I do not believe it is adequate.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is an authority on this. I should like to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and let him give a better answer than I have been able to give.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and I, approximately 10 years ago, conducted an intensive study leading to legislation in this very field. I do not know of any bill that was more complicated upon which I have worked than that particular legislation and the problems with which we were faced at that time. It still persists to a degree today. That is the problem that the committees having jurisdiction—instead of just being one committee such as the Committee on Armed Services—at that time the jurisdiction was reposed in at least five different committees.

We did, however, at that time completely revise the survivor benefit package for armed services personnel in a bill which was called the survivor's benefits bill. This bill which was enacted as Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress, gave an increase in benefits to the widows of these veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I wish therefore to say to the gentleman that the statement made by the chairman is essentially correct. As he had indicated primarily jurisdiction of this matter reposes in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Moreover, as the gentleman knows, members of the armed services are entitled to social security benefits and survivor benefit protection afforded by that law. Therefore, the Committee on Ways and Means does have jurisdiction in that respect.

In addition to this, any man who is on active duty may, prior to his retirement, make an election to receive a reduced amount of monthly retired pay and thus provide additional survivor benefit protection for his loved ones.

So it is that if we change one element of survivor benefit protection for the armed services the Congress of the United States must necessarily address itself at the same time, to the other elements if it is to get at the heart of the problem. However, the basic premise as posed by the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], for a very satisfactory explanation of this matter insofar as I am concerned at least, not only with reference to a very pressing problem, but as to the intention of the committee with reference to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to conclude my remarks by saying to them, among other things, that it does seem to me that an increase in this particular allotment for a widow would certainly represent an encouragement to, perhaps, develop more enlistments of career personnel in the armed services.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wish to again commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] as well as all of the members of the Committee on Armed Services for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today for its action. Further, I wish to say that you are legislating in this case upon a matter which is not a simple one in order to insure that the widow and the dependents are adequately protected.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to section 9(a) of the bill which appears at page 14 and which states as follows:

Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upwards, there shall immediately be placed into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

Would the gentleman from South Carolina be so kind as to explain this section?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That is, for the benefit of

myself and for the benefit of the other members of the Committee?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if these other increments which are contained in the bill now pending before the other body on behalf of classified employees, go into effect automatically, a similar pay increase will go into effect upon the same date for the military, and in another year, the same would be true.

Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to know the estimated cost of this proposed legislation? If the gentleman does, I shall be happy to tell him, if he wants to know.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. It will cost a lot of money, about \$2.7 billion.

Mr. GROSS. The other bill for the classified employees carries an estimated cost of \$2.6 billion for classified and postal workers.

Mr. RIVERS. I will tell you what we did. The simple fact of the matter is that it reminds me of a poem which I heard the other day which went like this:

Oh Lord, as I go my own way,

Help me to remember that somewhere out there,

Someone died for me today.

I am sure that I know about which the gentleman from Iowa is speaking. These fellows are just names insofar as many people are concerned, but we have no apology or have no compunction for including this provision in the bill. I am sure, however, that we will have the backing of the Committee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that the gentleman from South Carolina will have the backing of the Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. If so, it will be the first time that the gentleman from Iowa has not backed the military. You are just kidding me. I know all about you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask this question:

Is the first installment of the pay increase dependent upon the enactment of pay increases for Classification Act and other Federal workers?

Mr. RIVERS. No, sir; this initial 4.5-percent increase will be effected whether or not the other bill passes. But should the contingencies occur which are contained in the other bill, then these second- and third-stage increases will also be given the uniformed services.

Mr. GROSS. I would just like to say that I believe that any pay bill that comes to the House should be supported by the proponents on the basis of merit.

Mr. RIVERS. That is right. This pay increase is primarily based on the cost-of-living adjustment. The gentleman could have voted against the other bill, and still be consistent by voting for this one.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see how I can.

Mr. RIVERS. This is nothing but a pay increase based on the cost of living.

Mr. GROSS. That is what was said about the other pay bill.

Mr. RIVERS. I will say to the gentleman these people are committed to die for you.

Let me read this little poem that someone sent to me, written by Grantland Rice. It goes like this:

TWO SIDES OF WAR

All wars are planned by older men
In council rooms apart.
They call for greater armament
And map the battle chart.

But out along the shattered fields
Where golden dreams turned gray
How very young their faces were
Where all the dead men lay.

Portly and solemn in their pride
The elders cast their vote
For this or that or something else
And sound the warlike note.

But where their sightless eyes stare out,
Beyond life's vanished joys,
I've noticed nearly all the dead
Were hardly more than boys.

These are they for whom we speak out.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that despite all the poetry I have an idea—

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman want to hear some more?

Mr. GROSS. No. I could give the gentleman a little poetry, but I do not want to spend all afternoon in that way.

Mr. RIVERS. I think this is pretty good, do you not?

Mr. GROSS. It is all right.

Let me say to the gentleman that with or without a pay increase, I have confidence that the men who compose the U.S. military forces will fight for this country.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course they have, and they will.

The gentleman knows that they do not have a lobby.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe we have to worry—

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman knows that one cannot buy dedication or motivation in sacrificing one's life for their country, and their willingness to die for it. These men do not have a lobby like some of the other people have. The only lobby they have is the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Iowa, and I am sure he will support this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I know something about pay. My first pay in the Army was \$15 a month—in gold.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I join with the others of my colleagues who have complimented the gentleman from South Carolina and his committee for your fine work in bringing this bill out at this time under arduous and difficult conditions. I know I speak the truth when I say that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has earned the undying gratitude of hundreds of thousands of men in uniform who look forward to his leadership.

The pay represented here is meager enough. Our men in uniform are dying in the service of this country and that can hardly be measured by money.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to raise a question at this time and I do not know that it can be answered at this time. But there is quite a bit of interest in this matter in my particular district. It has to do with recomputation and

comparability pay and as to when you hope that there may be some action on this matter.

Mr. RIVERS. That was resolved on May 12, 1960, when the House passed H.R. 11318 which authorized recomputation. However, we could not get to first base with the Senate. It was passed by the House, and you will remember I had a fight with my own chairman and with Members of the other body to try to complete congressional action—but could not get it done. I might as well be honest with you. As much as I think it was justified then on the basis of a Government contract, we could not get it. I simply could not see any hope for it now. I may just as well be realistic in answering the gentleman.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I know the gentleman did everything he could.

Mr. RIVERS. If it were possible, I sure would have tried to get it.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank all of your colleagues on the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNEY. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee for bringing this pay bill before the House.

Some of those boys who just got back on the U.S.S. *Forrestal* were wielding hoses when the fire broke out.

If any Member here thinks that \$90.45 a month is worth wielding that hose when the bombs are going off all around, then I say that those men do need some lobbyists in this House.

I hope that this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure that it will.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa who thought I was being facetious with him—you do not compare this military pay with civilians. The two are different things altogether.

Our service people are dying for our country, and I am willing to pay them without any apology.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for the many things he has done for our men in uniform, and the chairman of the subcommittee that made a special investigation on the M-16 rifle.

Mr. RIVERS. I wrote to the gentleman about that today.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by the thoroughness of this report and the fact that they called for added testing of the rifle and the ammunition. I will be glad when the gentleman can report something to the House as to their findings in the effort to make sure that our men in battle have the very best weapons that our technology is capable of producing.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say the sole source of procurement was a mistake. We told the Secretary of Defense that he made a

great mistake by using a sole source also in the procurement of the ammunition.

The subcommittee which looked into that under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Ichord] and other members of that distinguished subcommittee pointed this out. We have written to the GAO and also written to the Secretary of Defense demanding that we be kept advised because that rifle is vital to the defense of this country.

I thank the gentleman for the assistance that he has given us.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. Can he tell us if the testing that has been recommended by the Ichord subcommittee is now underway?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to express support not only for the bill, H.R. 13510, as to its general provisions, but specifically for section 9(a) on page 14 of the bill which, if I understand it correctly will assure that our military pay differential will not get worse in 1968 and 1969, if there is an increase for classified employees in accordance with the bills that are presently pending before the Congress.

I am one of those who believes, with the chairman of this committee, that if there is a comparability gap in the pay of people who serve the U.S. Government, there is more of a gap in the case of the pay for our military people in the Armed Forces than there is in the case of any other employee in our Federal service.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree with the gentleman.

Our committee has tried to keep that gap from getting any wider than it is now.

This bill for the first time automatically insures that should these second- and third-stage pay increases to which I referred in my colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa go into effect, the military will also be given an equivalent increase.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to be counted as one Member who says I think the committee has done the wise thing in this particular instance and I certainly commend the gentleman and his committee and they have my wholehearted support.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would not wish this opportunity to pass without paying a tribute to the gentleman in the well, the great chairman of our Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RIVERS].

I do not know of any man that I have ever known who has shown a deeper heartfelt interest in our service people than the gentleman now in the well.

Today, at noontime, something happened. Our guest chaplain today is an oldtime friend of mine. He is one of the great outstanding leaders of the African Methodist Church. He was born in South Carolina. When he had finished the

prayer offering, the gentleman in the well [Mr. RIVERS], a native of South Carolina, a great son of South Carolina, went up and greeted our guest chaplain with warmth and cordiality.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from South Carolina is doing a great job. He is an honor to his State; he is an honor to the United States of America.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed 34 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

As we approach this bill, we are taking one further step along the road to bring the pay of our servicemen more into line with the pay of others in our country. Some say we should not compare—yet military should not suffer by comparison.

As our technology grows, it takes longer not only to build new weapons systems, but also longer to teach our servicemen how to use the new weapons and how to keep them in service. The complexities of our missile systems, our new airplanes, our radars, and our sonars are readily apparent to all who have had any opportunity to examine them even most cursorily.

With the heart of our defense effort centered on this kind of technical equipment, it becomes even more important to maintain the cadre of our services, and to try to minimize the turnover in our forces. When a veteran leaves the service to be replaced by a new man, there is a loss of invaluable experience, and there is an added cost of training. The security of our Nation will be enhanced if we can decrease the turnover in our services.

Certainly we cannot expect those who make the armed services their life's career to subsidize the security of the Nation through substandard pay. Since we must maintain a group of full-time career personnel available to use the latest technologies in our defense, it is incumbent on us to see that they do not suffer financially through this decision.

At the present time, the indications are that we are not maintaining this group. For instance, the overall reenlistment rate at the end of the first term for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1967 has dropped to 18.8 percent from 23.2 percent in 1966. The Army dropped to 23.7 from 28 percent; the Navy dropped to 18.9 from 23.7 percent; the Marine Corps dropped to 10.6 from 16.3 percent; and the Air Force dropped to 16.8 from 18.9 percent. Thus we have fewer deciding to make the services their lifetime career to begin with.

There is a further decline in the reenlistment rate for second and subsequent reenlistments. Thus, in the Department of Defense, the overall drop was to 81.1 from 87.7 percent. In the Army the drop has been to 74.2 from

83.4 percent; in the Navy, the drop is to 80.9 from 89.6 percent; in the Marine Corps it is 77.9 from 88.6 percent and in the Air Force the drop has been to 88 from 89.7 percent.

So far I have been talking about enlisted men only. Now let me turn to officers. There are two groups of officers on whom statistics are readily available—the ROTC officers and the Academy graduates.

With respect to the ROTC, the number staying on after the obligated service in the Army dropped to 14.8 percent in fiscal year 1967 from 19.8 percent in fiscal year 1966. In the Air Force the number dropped to 46.3 from 48.4 percent. In the Marine Corps, the number dropped to 36 from 49 percent. No figure was available from the Navy.

For the graduates from the service academies, the numbers of those continuing on past the 5 years after commissioning has showed a drop. In the Army the drop was to 75 from 81 percent. In the Navy, the drop was to 82.9 from 86.1 percent. The Marine Corps dropped to 76 from 81 percent. The last figures available for the Air Force are with respect to fiscal years 1965 and 1966. These too show a drop to 77.8 from 84.8 percent.

In general, compared to fiscal year 1966, there are 5 percent fewer enlisted men staying on after the end of their first term, 5 percent fewer enlisted men reenlisting after the second and later terms, 5 percent fewer ROTC officers staying on after their obligated service, and 5 percent fewer Academy graduates staying on after 5 years after their commissioning.

These figures clearly pinpoint the need to provide additional incentives to make the military service a career.

The Armed Services Committee has been trying to bring the pay of the military personnel into line with other pay for a number of years. We believe we are making progress, but much still needs to be done.

In 1963 and in 1965 we made efforts to bring the military pay more into line with what the civilian employees of the Government are receiving. At the same time efforts were made by the Congress more properly to align the civilian pay with the pay outside of Government.

Thus in 1963 we reported to the House:

In summary, abundant evidence was developed from witnesses of the Department of Defense that the critical enlisted retention problem in all the services is associated with retaining individuals in most of the technical occupations upon completion of their initial term of service.

It is obvious to the Committee on Armed Services that we are not now retaining or attracting a sufficient number of the types of individuals so vital to our national security. This situation is becoming steadily more acute in the face of increased competition not only from private industry, but from within the Government itself.

Again in 1965 we reported:

The failure of military pay levels to keep pace with wage adjustments provided Federal civilian employees and workers in the private sector of our economy has contributed significantly to the inability of the military departments to attract and retain adequate numbers of qualified career personnel. This

fact is evident in that among the various reasons given by personnel who elect not to continue their military careers is, invariably, the inadequacy of military compensation.

The inability to attract and retain adequate numbers of highly qualified career personnel is shared by all the military departments. While the problem is particularly acute in the Department of the Navy, as evidenced publicly by the recent plea made by the Secretary of the Navy in which he requested both enlisted and officer personnel who had completed their obligated service to voluntarily extend their period of service so as to enable the Navy to properly meet its operational commitments, it is nevertheless a problem faced by all the services.

This year the efforts are being continued. The President has requested an increase for the civilian employees in order to bring them more into line with outside employment, and an increase for our military, who are still behind. Thus the President recommended a 4.5-percent increase for the civilian employees of the Federal Government in order to "take the final step this year to achieve full comparability with private industry." It was to achieve this parity that the House has already passed the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967.

Now we are to take one more step in bringing the military pay along with the civilian pay. The President has recommended a 4.5-percent increase in the military pay in order to maintain the present comparability. The military pay, however, is not solely the salary as it is with civilian employees. There are additional benefits. No increase was made in the additional benefits. In order to provide the proper increase, then, the base pay only of the military personnel was increased and this was increased 5.6 percent in order to equate it with the overall 4.5-percent increase recommended by the President.

We also want to look to the future for the military personnel. There are already pay increases scheduled for July 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969. As insurance, in case the Congress should fail to do anything further about the military pay, it is provided that any increase given to the civilians would automatically create a comparable increase for the military. Let me hasten to assure you, however, that the Committee on Armed Services does not expect to sit back and do nothing further with respect to the military pay. We expect to continue our efforts to bring the military pay more into line with the civilian pay, and we expect actively to study and suggest further general and special accommodations as may be needed.

This bill is fair and equitable. It should receive the full endorsement of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

No matter how it is explained, there is forward pricing in this bill, as there was in the Class Act bill and the postal pay increase bill, is that correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Some of us were violently opposed to that. I do not see how

those of us who opposed the two-stage increase in those bills could possibly support this bill with a two-stage increase in it, establishing a pay increase in the unknown future. We do not have the slightest idea what the situation will be in 18 months, or even 12 months from now. I do not see how we can accept a bill of this kind with the forward pricing in it any more than we could accept the pay bill which passed the House.

Moreover, would there have been a military pay bill before the House had Congress seen fit to reject the pay increase for Class Act workers? It was much heralded around here that there would be no increase for the military, that it was predicated upon the Class Act bill.

I like to believe that pay for any segment of the employees of this Government, whether military or civilian, ought to be based upon merit.

Mr. BATES. I want to say very clearly to the gentleman from Iowa that this pay bill—and the pay bill for the military in January will be the same—is clearly based on merit. I make no apology for that.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say for the Record that irrespective of the bill in the other body, a pay bill for the military would have been forthcoming this year. The only difference was in amount.

I want the gentleman from Iowa to hear this. This bill is not contingent. The only thing which connects it with the bill in the other body is that if the two incremental increases go into effect they will go into effect for the military. Otherwise this bill is totally independent of the other. It is based upon the question of the cost of living.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that this bill was approved in the committee and then held in committee for a considerable period of time before being reported out?

Mr. BATES. The bill was held in the committee for a week or two.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and it was brought out only after the other pay bill was passed; was it not?

Mr. BATES. That is correct. However, I will tell the gentleman from Iowa quite frankly that this was done because we were not going to give to the military anything less than we gave to the civilians. So, our position this year has been clearly consistent.

Furthermore, we cannot say to the veteran or to the military personnel fighting for us that we are not going to grant to them the same as that which we grant to others. In other words, we say that we are going to give to them exactly what we give to the others in our civilian employment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to state that I believe I have supported every military bill during the 19 years

I have been in Congress. But, I do not see how I can support this bill, having voted against the other pay raise bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the principal reasons for this is the two-stage increase that would automatically increase pay as much as 18 months hence.

How can I be expected to now determine the uncertain future and approve a pay bill for the military based upon these uncertainties?

Mr. BATES. I do not believe that this will become operative because I believe there will be a new pay bill based on the Department of Defense studies which will go into effect on or after the first of the year. But, everyone has to live with his own conscience. I want to make certain, however, that the military receives the same treatment as the civilian employees of this Government receive.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I find myself in somewhat the same position as does the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], having voted with the gentleman on the postal and classified employees pay bill, my objection being the step increases.

Frankly, I would much rather be in the position today of taking your original percentage of increase than taking the two incremental increases in one lump sum, if that could be offered.

Is there any suggestion or any evidence to the effect that this 4.5-percent increase is actually adequate or is an attempt to only conform to the bill that was passed providing increases for our postal employees and for our classified workers?

Mr. BATES. I do not believe it is adequate. This is a stopgap piece of legislation going back to the first of October. However, after the first of the year, we will get a pay bill which is being thoroughly prepared. We will not necessarily follow the recommendations of the Department of Defense. However, we shall hold extensive hearings upon it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in this first increment it is designed to conform with the President's budgetary proposal?

Mr. BATES. This is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. So it is in the budget?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the second and third incremental increases, has there been any estimated cost of them in dollars and cents?

Mr. BATES. This bill which is pending before us, if the gentleman will look on page 4 of the report, calls only for 9 months this fiscal year at an estimated cost of \$626 million. The full year the estimated cost is \$810 million. However, an adjustment in cost has taken place since the report was prepared. The present estimated cost is \$555 million for 9 months of this particular year.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman agree—again going back to the original part of my question—does

the gentleman have any estimate as to the cost of the second and third incremental steps of the proposed increase?

Mr. BATES. Yes. If the information which has been made available to me is correct the second and third steps if they should go into effect, would come to an estimated cost of about \$2.7 billion.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer the gentleman from Illinois to page 15 of the report.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I can understand the attitude of many people here today about any pay bill. However, it so happens that the very objections that were raised or mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] when we had the postal rate and pay bill pending before us, were dealt with in a motion to recommit.

When that motion to recommit came on for a vote, I voted for it. However, it did not prevail. As a matter of fact the margin of the vote was but by a small percentage. However, when we came to the final passage, when we voted for the increases contained in the bill, without the motion to recommit, or you voted for no bill.

So now anyone can place his money and take his choice on that.

I do not believe it is a matter of sitting around in the Committee on Armed Services waiting for some other committee to act. As a matter of fact, we worked very diligently and very carefully, and we have come up with these figures.

Now, I agree with the gentleman completely. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable—it would be unconscionable to give to the people in the military service less than we give to the civilian employees. As a matter of fact, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that a great many people in this body, and we have seen a recent publicity announcement about it lately, favor increasing the pay by tremendous amounts with the intent to move in the direction of a volunteer army. So I can understand that viewpoint. But obviously we cannot do that now.

This country is at war, whether we like it or not. We are at war, and we have a lot of people who are having to make sacrifices, as American boys through all history had to make such sacrifices. So it seems to me that whatever one may have thought about that other pay bill for civilian employees, this bill represents the absolute least that we can do for our boys who are really carrying the burden.

Mr. BATES. I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments. I agree with him fully and, like the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Iowa, I voted for the motion to recommit, but we did not win. We did not prevail. And this other bill went into effect. So we are living with the situation, not the one we had hoped to have, but a situation that other Members voted to have enacted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but some of us—and I happen to be the one who offered the motion to recommit, and did so for the purpose, among others, of trying to stop the two-step increase. Then I voted against the bill because I felt that it violated my financial responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives for how can I today look into the unknown future insofar as the cost of these automatic increases and the ability of the taxpayers to pay the bills.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I would say—

Mr. GROSS. I still feel that way, and I do not see how I can possibly compromise my position. Take the automatic provision out of the bill and I will vote for it, but I cannot vote for it as it now stands.

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I voted for the gentleman's motion to recommit, I followed him that time, and I hope he follows us today.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that?

Mr. BATES. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have learned here many times the hard way that we do not always have our own way. I have been here, voting on some measures involving pay increases for people in the Government when I believe at one time I was one of 37 out of 435—and I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts who is now in the well was with me at that time.

But a pattern has been set here. I do not care whether one says that the Committee on Armed Services is following along with another committee or not, because we did not follow anybody, except in timing. But we have now a situation where this House of Representatives—and I finally voted for the civilian pay bill, I want to make that clear, but I did vote for the motion to recommit, because it was based on our own thinking, that they were entitled to some raise—but now the House of Representatives has voted and the question now is do we treat the boys in the military like we treat the other people, the other people in the civilian service? As far as I am concerned, that is not a tough decision.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the gentleman from Indiana has fairly stated the case. I am not going to get emotional about this situation, but there is plenty that we can get emotional about. I have been out at the Andrews Air Force Base when they brought the boys back from Vietnam. I have been out to Walter Reed Hospital. No one can be unaffected by such experiences.

I also want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that never once in my office have I ever had the doors knocked down by anybody in the military, and I want to say, to the contrary, that when the civilian pay bill came up there was not enough room in my office to take care of those who wanted me to vote as they saw fit.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with everything the gentleman from Massachusetts has said.

Mr. BATES. I hope the gentleman then joins us in voting for this.

Mr. GROSS. But with reference to the last remarks made by the gentleman concerning the vote on the motion to recommit, and the fact that it failed, I wish to say that when it failed I then voted against the civilian pay bill. I cannot compromise my position in voting against that bill by voting the pending legislation.

Mr. BATES. I do not intend to compromise the position of the people in the military. The gentleman from Iowa will have to make up his own mind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly right. The gentleman from Iowa will have to do whatever he believes is right. He has indicated that he is disgruntled. However, I happen to believe that a pattern has been set. It was not set by my vote, but it has been set because of the majority prevailing, and I am not going to discriminate against the people in the armed services.

Mr. BATES. I think we have covered the issue.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fair and it is equitable and it should receive the full endorsement of the House today.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, although I am reluctant to support any increase in expenditures owing to the conditions now existing in this country, it is, nevertheless, my purpose to vote for and support H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967. The House of Representatives a few weeks ago passed the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 (H.R. 7977). I voted against the latter bill because I did not, and do not now, believe that the national economy is such as to justify any increase in the pay of anyone serving the country in any capacity or at any level. However, since this civilian pay increase has passed the House, it is only fair and proper to vote for a pay increase for the servicemen who are making such a sacrifice for the salvation of our country and the preservation of our way of life.

It is not proper to raise the pay of any Government employees when the Government is laboring under a public debt of more than \$336 billion. The annual interest alone on the national debt is in excess of \$14 billion, approximately one-third more than was spent for all governmental purposes, including interest, by the Roosevelt administration in 1940, and no one has ever accused Mr. Roosevelt of being parsimonious when it came to spending the taxpayers' money. Under these conditions, I wonder where we will find the money with which to pay for these increases.

In proposing legislation to increase expenditures, the proponents of the same should be required to point out in the legislation the means by which the increases are to be financed. In this case, nothing is mentioned of the method of financing, and all that we know is that

it will add to the annual deficit and to the national debt, and thus bring further inflation and devaluation of our currency. We have nothing in the Treasury with which to pay these increases, and all we can do is add another item on the cuff.

We all know that Moses was the meekest man, Solomon the wisest, and Samson the strongest, but neither or all of them, acting in concert, could pay out a cent if he did not have it, and that is just about the condition we are in here today.

This wild orgy of spending must come to an end. The day of reckoning is here. The people are unable and unwilling to pay any more in taxes, and it is unsafe for us to embark on a limitless sea of indebtedness. This, I believe, is now clear to all, and the people of the country are at last aroused and are determined to do something about it. If the present Congress is unwilling to curb spending, the people in the next election will send a Congress here determined to do so.

We hear much in the Congress and read in the press of late with respect to certain cuts taking place here in the House of Representatives. There are few, if any, reductions in present or previous spending programs. The reductions have been made in the budget, and the budget is nothing more than a request by the executive departments for increased spending. Thus, a reduction in the budget, unless it goes beyond present spending, is really no reduction at all. It is a misnomer and serves to mislead the people of the country into believing that the House of Representatives is reducing expenditures when they are doing no such thing. I hope it can be made plain to the people at home that this is the situation.

It is natural for us to wish to increase salaries of our Government employees, and particularly the men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces. I would remind you, however, of the admonishment that comes down to us through the ages from the Gospel according to St. Matthew wherein it is said:

For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?

The sacrifice of our servicemen would mean less than nothing if they defeated the enemy, or even the whole world of enemies, and then lost their own country and their own souls. In such a case, all that we have struggled for and gained, and all that we hope to be, would be toppled over into the abyss of lost liberty.

It is incumbent upon us as representatives of the people of America, as well as these servicemen, to be as faithful and as patriotic, as diligent and determined, in defending our fighting forces on the homefront as it is their duty to defend us in the foreign fields.

Let me say in conclusion that the servicemen have no lobbyists and are not asking for anything. They belong to no union, save the Union of the United States of America, for which they have spilled their blood on the battleseas and

battlefields of the world. They deserve and must have the best that there is in America.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], our distinguished ranking minority member, have explained this bill in some detail and I believe it is pretty well understood by all Members.

I would like to direct my comments to some other matters of concern in our committee.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention first to what occurred last week in Washington.

Mr. Chairman, last weekend Washington witnessed a tremendous gathering of vulgar, nondescript creatures bent on destroying our very Nation. But we observed with pride that the situation was handled neatly and effectively by the handful of dedicated servicemen and Federal officials to whom the task was assigned. Their forbearance and restraint in the face of untold provocation deserve the highest praise. In addition, their appearance and conduct were in startling contrast to the mawkish miserable masses confronting them as the maliciousness of the latter's demonstration unfolded for all to see.

According to today's paper, that demonstration cost the American taxpayers more than \$1 million. Perhaps in the future, we would be well advised, as a condition precedent to the issuing of an assembly or parade permit, to require the posting of a cash bond in a sum sufficient to pay for all expenses, including damage caused and the cost of cleanup.

We must, of course, be careful not to let what has happened lead to steps which would in any way foreclose proper dissent. No matter how vigorous or unpopular. But I know of nothing in our constitutional guarantee of freedom of assembly or speech which requires this Government to permit, condone, or tolerate actions of individuals or groups whose purpose is the violent overthrow of this Government. Nor do I know, Mr. Chairman, of any right which any American or alien has to use mob techniques to impede or impair the ability of officials of this Government to perform their statutory responsibilities.

Understandably, there is much disagreement about our foreign policy and the conduct of the war in Vietnam. For myself, however, I completely support the President's policies for Vietnam, and I am sure that he is seeking every possible way to end the war honorably. But support for the President does not lessen your responsibilities and mine—and not just our constitutional responsibilities to raise and support the necessary military forces and to provide them with the best of equipment. We have the responsibility, also, to make constructive suggestions.

This is my duty—not only a Member of Congress, but also as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on National Defense Posture, which Chairman RIVERS appointed on August 1, to conduct a full

and thorough inquiry into various phases of our national security. The other members of the subcommittee are Messrs. HÉBERT, STRATTON, HALLECK, and DICKINSON. Mr. RIVERS and Mr. BATES are ex officio members.

Our task, in the broadest terms, is twofold: First, to determine the military obligations, both actual and potential, imposed on us by our worldwide commitments and foreign policy objectives, and second, to assess the capability of our Armed Forces to meet these obligations. Within this framework, we have been directed, among other things, to determine the status of plans, including contingency plans, for achieving a victory in Southeast Asia and the personnel and equipment required to get the job done.

In order to make the undertaking more manageable, we intend to concentrate on one geographical area at a time. We have, of course, selected Southeast Asia for our takeoff point.

Because of the security classification of the testimony, information, and documents we must consider, all of our work up to now has been in executive session. The decision was also made that the work of the subcommittee could best proceed—and the national interest best be served—by conducting our inquiry with minimum publicity. Therefore, we have issued no press releases and have made no announcements of our activities and plans.

However, I feel that you will want to know that we have heard preliminarily from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Department of State. The information and data which we are assembling in this manner will help establish the foundation for the more detailed inquiry to follow, including an intensive field examination.

Although we are some weeks from findings and conclusions, I can report that the picture in Vietnam is brighter than I had expected to find it.

However, it is becoming increasingly evident that, if we are to get on with the job and bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion, some significant improvements in the Defense Department's military decisionmaking process are in order.

Basically, we all have a common duty—a duty to country. Not a selfish or self-serving duty, but an interlocking, combined effort of all parts of our Nation and Government for the common good.

Under the Constitution, it is the solemn responsibility of the Congress to provide for the common defense by raising and supporting military forces which are adequate to insure our national security. And it is the unquestioned responsibility of the President to be the Commander in Chief of those forces.

It is upon this principle of coequal constitutional functions that our national security depends—Congress provides the sword which is wielded by the President. The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, states that the Secretary of Defense shall be the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the national defense. He,

therefore, becomes the President's agent in furnishing the Congress with factual information in order that the Congress can provide for the common defense. I emphasize "provide for the common defense," for these are the words that constitute our mandate.

Congress has underscored the close cooperation which should exist between the military and the legislative branch by stating in the National Security Act:

No provision of this act shall be so construed as to prevent a secretary of a military department or a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from presenting to the Congress, on his own initiative, after first informing the Secretary of Defense, any recommendation relating to the Department of Defense that he may deem proper.

Unfortunately, the existing procedures in the Department of Defense are producing some serious roadblocks in our obtaining this information. Instead of supporting the team effort that is called for, there is more of a tendency to make that Department a one-man show. There is also evidence to indicate that the Secretary of Defense, in reaching his decisions on purely military matters, may be giving undue weight to the recommendations of his civilian staff planners as opposed to those of the heads of the military services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

One thing is certain. The secretaries of the military departments and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not beating a path to the doors of Congress with recommendations, as contemplated by law.

However, there has been a manifestation of interest on the part of some of the secretaries in how we are doing our work.

The law also specifically provides that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the principal military advisers to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. I can say with some assurance that the Secretary of Defense seldom seeks advice from the Joint Chiefs. Our information is that he does meet with them each Monday, with many others also present, and he does most of the talking.

I can add with even more assurance that the Joint Chiefs seldom directly advise either the President or the National Security Council.

The aim of the Armed Services Committee, and the main effort of the Subcommittee on National Defense Posture, is to promote the national security and improve our military posture. As I indicated earlier, we have a duty to uphold our responsibilities as a member of the national defense team.

We are not engaged in any witch hunt. We have no preconceived conclusions. Nor should it be assumed that the subcommittee has any desire to embarrass anyone in the Department of Defense. We are making every effort to do this job as objectively as it can be done. Indeed, the very nature of the inquiry demands this. We are concerned with national survival and Mr. McNamara should welcome our help, just as we welcome his.

Many of the present membership were serving in this Chamber when the National Security Act was enacted and later

amended to grant broad powers to the Secretary of Defense in recognition of the burdens of his office. At no time, however—and I cannot emphasize this too strongly—at no time did we act to disturb the constitutional mandate to the Congress as expressed in article I, section 8.

We had hoped that in vesting the Secretary of Defense with these broad powers we were not disturbing the right of Congress to call on representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines for frank discussions on the state of our defenses and our ability to preserve our national security.

My concern is simply this—the Congress is powerless to carry out its mandate and discharge its constitutional duties unless accurate, candid, and timely information is provided by officials and officers of the Defense Establishment. We cannot meet our obligation if the information we receive has been run through a screening process to filter out elements of divergent opinion and factors which may suggest that Pentagon decisions are sometimes less than perfect. We are entitled—indeed it is essential—to have officers of the services speak freely, and we must have the best, most professional advice available if we are to provide our fighting forces the basic necessities and arms that should be second to none.

Certain procedures and policies of the Department of Defense, in effect, constitute an impediment to the constitutional process. As Members of Congress, our time is severely limited and there simply is not time in a 24-hour period for us to devote full time to one committee, one pending law, or the voluminous correspondence piled high on our desks. It seems completely unnecessary that we spend endless hours to elicit the needed information from reluctant witnesses who are gagged and hamstrung in advance. In order to reach sound conclusions, our people in uniform must be able to speak freely and candidly, and not be limited to presenting predigested statements which contain only what the Secretary wishes us to know.

Because of the frequent apparent lack of candor or full responsiveness to congressional inquiries, it can be reasonably concluded that the Department of Defense does not understand that congressional involvement in our national defense posture stems from more than idle curiosity—that Congress is not merely an interested observer in military affairs, but a very active participant. This congressional participation is a fact of life and an inseparable part of the constitutional process. Unless this is accepted, we will have a house divided.

Gen. Omar Bradley understood these processes, and I would like to quote that distinguished American. Speaking before the House Appropriations Committee in 1948, he said:

Under our form of government, the military policy of the United States is shaped by the Congress, not by the Armed Forces . . . because of the fact that Congress controls the appropriations which in the final analysis do control military policy, the size of forces, and so forth.

The uneasiness that pervades the Nation today is born of unanswered ques-

tions. The work of the Congress can result in meaningful legislation only if the Department of Defense adopts a cooperative policy. Unless the Congress is included in the huddle, the signals of the Commander in Chief will never be understood by vital members of the team.

Lately we have been hearing about a credibility gap. The credibility gap that concerns me most is the one between the Congress and the Defense Department which has widened over the years. This ought not to be. It will be a tragedy indeed if, at this late hour, the President's conduct of the war becomes increasingly regarded as a mishmash of dissent, confusion, and skepticism because of the Department's failure to understand and accept the true role of Congress in our national defense.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill and believe it is a substantial step toward something we all desire—the establishment of a career military which hopefully can some day make the draft obsolete and unnecessary.

This bill is a very favorable reflection of the able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking Republican on the committee.

I do have a couple of minor reservations which I recognize must succumb to the practical situation of the moment. I expressed reservations in the committee to section 9 which, for this time at least, establishes a prospective pay increase based upon what has been done for civil service and postal field service employees.

I know that throughout this debate it has been made amply clear that this is not intended to be a precedent for the future. But in an abundance of caution, and to tie it down in simple words once more, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if I am correct when I make the statement that tying a future pay increase to what is done for postal and civil service employees, as is done in section 9, is only a temporary situation to meet a temporary problem, and in no way constitutes a precedent for the future establishment of military pay?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman is correct. Neither does it make us committed to this. Furthermore, there is a study going on now in the Department of Defense which may change the entire philosophy of how we pay the military. We may junk all of this in the future, and a lot of what has been done in the past, if we accept it. We do not know what we will do.

We say this, "If you pay these people in the future, give the military comparable consideration."

That is it.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman. Those words are very reassuring to me.

I do have one other pang of conscience about this bill. Again, I recognize that the practical situation of the moment deems we cannot do anything about it.

I refer to the question of recomputation of retired military pay. For more

than 100 years, retired military pay was based upon current active-duty pay. Every time there was a change in active-duty pay the retiree was entitled to recompute his retired pay on the basis of the current active-duty pay. For 100 years that was the case. It was a moral right and it was a legal right of every person who retired from military service.

In 1958, Congress did an about-face and said that in the future a retiree could only have his retired pay increased in accordance with the cost of living or the consumer price index.

We did not repeal the law which called for recomputation. In fact, 5 years elapsed before we repealed that law.

Then in 1963 we did repeal the law, and we did pass another pay bill, and we corrected the injustice which was done to those retired prior to June 1, 1958, by allowing them to recompute on the basis both of the 1958 act and of the 1963 act. Then recomputation was cut off for the future.

It is my contention that we have a moral and a legal obligation to all of those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, to make good on the bargain which we made with them, because they retired under circumstances where they had a legal right to recompute.

Although Congress served notice to all those who retired after June 1, 1958, and acted in good faith to that extent—even though I may not have agreed with it—the Congress did not act in good faith with respect to those who retired prior to June 1, 1958.

I recognize we are confronted with a tight, perilous fiscal situation, and to talk about adding still another \$30 million, or perhaps as much as \$117 million, to this bill is not practical in this time of crisis. However, I cannot let this moment pass without merely reiterating what I have always believed, that Congress has broken faith with those who retired prior to June 1, 1958. I hope someday to see that breach of faith corrected.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I speak on this bill with some trepidation. In May I spoke on a bill out of the Armed Services Committee on the subject of student deferments, and I got some 41 Members to vote with me. Then in August I spoke on a bill regarding military construction. I got one other Member to vote with me.

The tide is not running my way. I just hope that my speaking on behalf of this bill does not jeopardize its chances of passage. I thank the distinguished chairman for taking that chance.

I merely would like to say, although I was dubious about the conditions of the draft bill and I may have questioned the conditions under which our military people participate in their involuntary servitude, I am not going to combine that with slave wages also.

This bill did pass the Armed Services Committee unanimously. I do not see, really, how any Member of the House of

Representatives can vote against it. I guarantee I cannot.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I should like to point out, as just stated by my colleague from New York, after a lot of consideration this bill was reported unanimously.

I believe that result came about because of our hard-working chairman and ranking minority Member working together, with all of us on the committee, in these times which we face.

Whether the Members may agree with our policy in Vietnam or not, we are there by virtue of the acts of our Commander in Chief. Whether Members agree or not, we should show overwhelming support of our men who have made our freedom possible, have made our freedom of speech real, and have made it possible for those who want to speak out to so speak today.

Unfortunately, this does lead some people in other sections of the world to not understand the basic principles of our Constitution, and how we can permit that, yet have the determination to carry out our commitments to the world.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a brief, but deserved statement of gratitude to the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina. I know that I speak for the members of the committee and our colleagues here in the House when I say that it is with the most profound admiration that we recognize the fine and courageous leadership, hard work, and tremendous ability of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we are presently considering H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967, and we meet in a time of conflict. Those in the uniformed services of the United States are Federal employees. They are engaged in that most basic function of the Federal Government—the provision for the common defense.

Who among us could fail to grasp the need for the maintenance of a capable, well-paid group of men in the uniformed services of the Nation? This measure has nothing to do with support for or opposition to the struggle in Southeast Asia. It is a simple matter of equity—fair treatment for those engaged in the service of the American public.

During recent weeks we have passed favorably upon pay raises for both Federal classified employees and postal workers. The former received a 4.5-percent pay increase this year, and the latter, a raise of 6 percent. This bill provides for a 5.6-percent increase in the uniformed services' pay. It will allow this particular group of people in the Federal service to keep pace with their counterparts in the various agencies and Federal departments.

Our committee took care to make a specific point that the pay increases outlined in this legislation be automatic. As our report points out, the new language in section 9 of the bill clarifies the measure sufficiently to avoid misconstruc-

tions of the law regarding Presidential discretion in the establishment of future pay increases for uniformed services personnel.

If the President has any changes to suggest, he may submit them to the Congress and we will consider them in the traditional manner. But if such recommendations are not forthcoming, or if they do not meet the approval of the Congress, our uniformed service employees will not be left in the lurch. They will retain the benefits of H.R. 7977, which guarantees the relative comparability of their pay with that of their Federal classified colleagues.

There are those who might say that servicemen are not paid in accordance with their real responsibilities, and that military pay in some categories ought to be sharply raised. There are others who would probably like to see a relative gain on the part of those who now sit at the bottom of the military pay structure. The committee has heard all these views, and it is my belief that there is truth on both these sides. For this reason, the bill we recommend here today allows the uniformed services to keep up with the rising cost of living with an immediate across-the-board raise. There is no limitation on the traditional prerogatives of the Congress. We may change any of the components of the rate structure as we deem fit.

The legislation has eight basic points: First, a basic monthly pay increase of 4.5 percent in "regular compensation."

Second, increased allowances provided under the Dependents Assistance Act for enlisted personnel in the lowest pay grades; E-1 through E-4, with less than 4 years of military service.

Third, provides authority to pay the basic allowance for quarters and the dislocation allowance to certain bachelor personnel.

Fourth, provides a special basic pay rate for the senior noncommissioned officer position of each military service.

Fifth, provides authority for the payment of "continuation pay" to physicians and dentists in the uniformed service, as an inducement to extending their periods of service beyond the obligated time.

Sixth, most importantly, it provides a refinement in the formula for computing future increases in the retired pay of uniformed services personnel responsive to changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Seventh, eliminates an inequity in the computation of retired pay for personnel who left the service prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Eighth, provides language which will insure that uniformed services personnel will, in the future, be given increases in the level of their compensation comparable to that enjoyed by their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government.

With respect to the American commitment to South Vietnam let me say the following: First, not all Americans have asked to fight there, many have been asked to go. Second, they serve with a very strong sense of duty. In the minds of those among us who support the President's policy goals, these fighting men

are heroes, and it is not our purpose here on this occasion to engage in a debate regarding our Vietnamese commitment. We are here to assure our uniformed service men and women equity in pay and benefits, so that when they serve this country—whether it be in peace or war, at home or far away—they may be sure in the knowledge that America is aware of their dedication and appreciative of their sacrifices. To oppose this bill on grounds of opposition to our foreign policy would be an exercise in futile and irresponsible discrimination against men and women dedicated to the public service.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that as a conscientious member of the Committee on Armed Services, this legislation has been given the most careful scrutiny of the committee. It is a responsible and well-reasoned measure designed to give the members of our uniformed services equitable treatment on the matter of compensation. If we desire to uphold the quality of the American services, let us insure that they receive adequate pay. If we desire to do right by those whose daily task is to defend us all, let us pass this bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I intend to support H.R. 13510, the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

There are 40 members of the Committee on Armed Services and on October 17, less than 10 days ago, every one of those members were present and unanimously approved the proposed pay increase for our uniformed service personnel. The matter was considered thoroughly. There were differences in viewpoint and considerable discussion and debate as to proper wording and phraseology, but when the time came for approval, there was not a single dissent. The bill was unanimously approved.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide adjustments in the regular compensation of members of the uniformed services, both active and retired, which are necessary because of increases in the cost of living.

Last April the President, in a message to Congress, underscored the necessity for an adjustment in compensation for our men and women in uniform. He suggested then that their compensation should be comparable to the civilian Government workers. In that same message he pointed to the need for pay increases if we expect to retain skilled manpower which is so vital to the maintenance of our national security. The President recommended in his message a 4.5-percent increase in what is described as "regular compensation." It is noteworthy the committee has accepted the present recommendation and it has not enlarged upon it. However, to avoid any misinformation, it should be recalled that military compensation includes elements other than basic pay which means that the 4.5-percent increase in regular compensation translates into a 5.6-percent increase in basic pay.

There are some eight important changes in the old law, including authority for the payment of continuation pay to physicians and dentists to insure their retention beyond their obligated periods of service. There are increases for allowances under the Dependents Assistance Act which will affect 270,000 personnel in the lowest four enlisted grades. This will provide a monthly dollar increase from \$5 to \$7.50 per eligible member. Among other provisions is the elimination of inequity in the computation of retired pay.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is section 9, which was rewritten under a committee amendment designed to insure uniformed services personnel increases in the level of their compensation comparable to the increases of their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government. The committee amendment set out in italic rephrases the original language and in effect substitutes a new section for old section 9.

The intent of this new language is to make clear that follow-on pay increases for the uniformed services will be equivalent to the second and third stage increases scheduled for Federal classified employees on June 1, 1968, and April 1, 1969, and will be automatic. The old section may have left some doubt as to Presidential discretion covering these future pay increases, but the new language removes any possible construction for Presidential discretion. There is a comprehensive compensation study being conducted by the Department of Defense and if this reaches Congress in a timely fashion, Congress may act on these Presidential recommendations and set aside the provisions embodied in section 9. If no recommendations are forthcoming, or if such are received and are not acted upon by the Congress and meanwhile the pay of Federal classified employees is increased in stages provided in H.R. 7977 as passed by the House on October 11, then under this new section 9, uniformed personnel will retain their relative comparability with that of their Federal classified coworkers.

This provision was regarded by the committee as a form of insurance that service pay will continue to remain comparable to that provided classified employees. If we had failed to include such language we would have failed to provide for the comparability principle.

There is no doubt that the enactment of this bill will be costly. It is estimated it will cost over \$630 million for the 9-month balance of fiscal year 1968, or from October 1 to June 30. One full year would cost approximately one-quarter more or about \$810 million.

If there is any part of this bill that is in any way to be questioned or raised as a possible controversy, it would have to be section 9 with its provision for automatic future increases in pay for the uniformed services. But the House acted affirmatively in providing such second- and third-stage increases for our civil servants and our postal employees.

There may be some Members who do not favor future increases for our service personnel but if we are to put the

matter in perspective we must recognize we are facing a condition and no longer a theory. The House has already acted to approve second and third stage increases for Federal classified employees. If we do not approve this bill today, including section 9 providing for stage increases for military personnel we will find ourselves in the position of discriminating against those in the uniformed services. For myself—I cannot see that happen. I am sure most Members do not wish to be placed in that position.

Repeating, the committee accepted the President's recommendation of 4.5 percent pay increase. Our only departure was the addition of provisions for fair and equitable future increases comparable to civilian contemporaries.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation deserves to be approved.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I favor the pending bill. It conforms with the action previously taken by the House with respect to a pay raise for Government employees. In this respect there can be no valid reason why pay raise for the military should not be comparable.

This bill was thoroughly considered by the House Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member. It was reported out unanimously. It is anticipated that the measure will be readily approved here today. While I will of necessity be absent when the vote is taken—because of a prior commitment in my district this evening—I want the record to show that if I were present I would vote in favor of passage of H.R. 13510.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, on this day when we are considering a very important piece of military legislation, I would like to take special note of a very important event which occurred earlier this month. I am referring to the announcement that Admiral Rickover is scheduled to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. As many of you know, he reached the mandatory retirement age of 64 on January 27, 1964. Because of his great contributions to the security of our Nation, he was asked to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. Upon the expiration of this first 2-year period beyond the mandatory retirement age, arrangements were fortunately made for continuation of Admiral Rickover on active duty for an additional 2 years. Since this second 2-year extension expires in January 1968, special arrangements had to be made to continue Admiral Rickover on duty beyond January 1968. If we can believe press reports that appeared earlier this month, strong force was exerted in certain quarters to end Admiral Rickover's career as an active officer. I believe the Nation as a whole should rejoice that these forces did not accomplish their objective, and that Admiral Rickover has been asked and has agreed to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years.

I want to express to Admiral Rickover my thanks and my relief that he will continue to work for the national security of our Nation. I am sure many of my colleagues in this Chamber join me in offering our assistance in any way that we can in order to help him in his work.

Admiral Rickover has made it possible for us to be first in the field of naval nuclear propulsion. I am sure we can look to him for maintenance of this leadership.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this measure. Despite my conservative fiscal approach to matters in the present serious financial situation of the country I believe that this measure is a just and a proper bill to enact.

Financing our Government and the war effort in Vietnam continues to be a most difficult problem. The situation can be summarized by a few figures. The national debt is now \$340 billion. The interest on the national debt each year is approximately \$14 billion, the largest single item after national defense. The deficit this year is estimated to be approximately \$30 billion. The costs of the war in South Vietnam are increasing and now run around \$2 billion each month.

In an effort to keep costs down, I voted against the pay raise bill for postal and classified Federal employees. I voted against the bill because I thought it was excessive in light of the present fiscal situation of our country, and also because it provided, improperly I thought, for procedures for a congressional pay raise. I would have happily voted for the employee pay raise suggested by the President in amount of 4.5 percent, but the pay raises involved in that legislation will within 2 years reach in the case of postal employees 12.8 percent and in the case of classified employees 17.2 percent. Further it is obvious that this country cannot in good conscience fail to make the comparable raise in pay for soldiers who are fighting for us in South Vietnam. When the military personnel are finally included in this pay raise situation, the total additional cost of this pay raise legislation will amount to an annual increase of \$5.1 billion. In my opinion that is excessive and not in the best interest of our country. But we cannot begin our economizing with those who risk their lives for our country.

Economists are unanimous in warning of inflationary trends, and it has been my firm conviction that we should keep down the costs of Government at this particular time, should close all inequitable loopholes in the tax laws, and we should try to do these things before we pass a tax increase. The dangers and inequities of inflation are so grievous that I am not pledging myself to refuse all tax increases until these other good objectives are achieved. It may well be that your Congressman may have to vote for a tax increase in order to fight inflation, if Congress as a whole will not bring about the fiscal reforms which I am supporting.

The following figures given to me by the Treasury Department are revealing as to the relative hurt coming to middle-income families from inflation as compared with a tax increase. An average American family with two children and income of \$7,500 paid an income tax in 1966 of about \$686. The President's 10 percent surtax proposal would add \$70 to their tax bill, or about \$5.83 per

month. Leading economists believe that without the surtax, prices will raise 4 percent more than they otherwise would have. This will mean that \$100 of consumer purchases—food, clothes, appliances—will cost \$104. If our average family spends one-third of its \$7,500 income, or some \$2,500 for purchases of consumer goods, it would cost them \$2,600 with the 4 percent increase in prices. This means an additional monthly cost to our average family of \$8.33, compared with the added cost I referred to earlier of \$5.83 per month which would result from the surtax. The surtax would save the family money—about \$30 a year—if you compare the cost of inflation. In any event we should pass the bill now before us.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967.

Substantial benefits will result from the enactment of H.R. 13510. The members of the Armed Forces will receive increased pay, which will compensate for recent cost-of-living increases. This House has passed legislation increasing the pay of civilian Federal employees; certainly we can do no less for our military men and women who serve around the globe.

The legislation before the Congress, if enacted, will increase the regular military compensation by 4.5 percent. This translates into a 5.6-percent increase in base pay. Equally important, the bill will increase the allowances, under the Dependents Assistance Act, of enlisted dependents in the lowest pay grades, from E-1 to E-4, with less than 4 years of military service.

The compensation of personnel in the junior ratings has always been too low, in my opinion, especially when those members have families to support.

The Armed Forces must be able to continue to attract qualified, highly motivated, and competent personnel as career officers and noncommissioned officers. Unless the pay scale is continually adjusted to compare favorably with civilian Federal pay, the military will surely lose many of its most talented and highly trained personnel to the civilian sector. I do not have to remind the Congress that never before has there been a greater need for professional performance in the Armed Forces.

This legislation does not solve all the problems of military pay inequities. It does accomplish part of the task, and therefore should be passed. The half-million men in Vietnam, of course, are giving the greatest measure of service to country, but there are also millions of other men and women, scattered throughout all the nations, who have left family and friends and home to serve their country in these difficult days. Their compensation must be adjusted to reflect the changing economic conditions of the day; every consideration given their civilian counterparts must be accorded them as well.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly favor and support this bill to increased the pay of our uniformed services.

This measure is sound, fair, well-drawn and does substantial justice to members of the armed services and their dependents.

The bill increases the regular military pay generally 4.5 percent, increases allowances under the Dependent Assistance Act for enlisted men in the lowest grades.

It also provides certain quarters and dislocation allowances, and provides a special pay rate for senior noncommissioned officers of all the military services.

It also provides "continuation pay" for doctors and dentists to insure or encourage their retention on active duty beyond their period of obligated service.

It proves a practical legal mechanism for automatically raising military pay when civilian pay is raised under the Consumer Price Index.

It permits computation of retired pay for limited classes of personnel retired prior to the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

It provides for a comparability principle in equating military and civilian Federal pay raises, under some conditions.

Certainly, we cannot allow military pay and allowances for those in our armed services, who are giving so much, and sacrificing so much for the country, to fall behind the rate increases for Federal civilian employees. This principle is so obvious that it needs no argument. The justification for this bill is virtually self-evident.

I urge that the House approve this bill by unanimous vote and I hope the provisions of the bill will become effective at an early date.

This is legislation that is a must, and it will be overwhelmingly approved by the people and the country.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to those who support the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1967, which is before this House today. Its enactment is essential to express the commitment of the country to those serving in our armed services.

The serviceman lives a life with a purpose as noble as any and more noble than most. It is time that we begin to recognize the responsibilities, duties, and sacrifices that he makes. One of the ways that this can be done, and I am first to admit that this is a very minimal way, but one essential, nevertheless, is to begin to pay him commensurate to what he gives.

In economic terms, the need for this legislation is compelling. A drafted private first class in combat makes \$170 a month, while a civilian warehouseman in Saigon earns \$1,000 a month. A GI clerk-typist earns \$170; a civilian secretary in Saigon, \$600. An Engineer Corps battalion commander makes \$958 while a civilian construction boss makes \$2,222 a month.

In substantive terms, the increases provided are very minimal. A recruit now receives \$90.60 a month. His pay would be raised \$5.10 a month.

A man just out of basic training receives \$100.50. His pay would go up \$6.40 a month.

A general with more than 30 years in the service now receives \$2,001.60 a month. His pay would be increased to \$2,113.80 a month.

Overall the increase will be 4.5 percent and over the next year and a half in-

creases in pay for the military will be similar to increases for civilians working for the Government.

I wish that the legislation would reward the serviceman more richly—now and in the future—although to reward him as richly as he deserves would be impossible.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that this House, after due consideration, will overwhelmingly approve this bill before us, H.R. 13510, designed to make equitable adjustments in certain allowances and to sensibly increase the basic pay of the members of the armed services of the United States.

The basic objective of this legislation is to effect necessary, realistic, upward adjustments in the pay scales of members of the uniformed services and to insure that they will, in the future, be given increases at the level of their compensation comparable to that granted their civilian contemporaries in the Federal Government.

It would seem very difficult, indeed, to justify any great disagreement with the fundamental purposes of this bill. Although all of us here are, as we should be, vitally concerned, especially in this critical period, with eliminating and suspending all nonessential Government spending, the expenditures here involved would certainly approach the top of any priority listing of unquestionably prudent investments of tax money in the public interest.

Our Defense Department officials and other authorities have submitted the most persuasive testimony showing that a disturbing number of promising career men are leaving the service because the compensation is not sufficient, under present economic conditions and demands, to enable them to properly provide for themselves and their families.

It is quite obvious to anyone that the highly specialized training and skill required for effective operation of the technical equipment necessary for modern military security makes it urgent for us to encourage career personnel in our military organizations to offset the high percentage of extravagantly expensive replacements being required because of the increasing numbers of nonreenlistments for financial reasons.

There is little need for me or anyone else to emphasize the fact that the efficiency of a military unit is no better than the spirit that exists among its individual members, and that individual spirit substantially depends upon the high morale existing in their own families, whether they are with them or whether they are forced to be away from them.

Therefore, assurances to military personnel and their families of reasonable rates of compensation, in accord with modern realities, that will enable them to live and to serve without extraordinary economic fears and anxieties is truly a major factor in the maintenance of high spirit and morale among the members of our military services and legislative action in creating such assurance is decidedly in the best national interest.

Let us, therefore, approve this measure without any unnecessary delay.

Mr. RIVERS, Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS"

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O-10 ¹	\$1,503.90	\$1,557.00	\$1,557.00	\$1,557.00	\$1,557.00
O-9	1,332.90	1,367.70	1,397.40	1,397.40	1,397.40
O-8	1,207.20	1,243.50	1,272.90	1,272.90	1,272.90
O-7	1,002.90	1,071.60	1,071.60	1,071.60	1,119.30
O-6	743.10	816.90	870.30	870.30	870.30
O-5	594.30	698.40	746.10	746.10	746.10
O-4	501.60	610.20	651.30	651.30	663.00
O-3 ²	466.20	520.80	556.20	615.90	645.30
O-2 ²	373.50	443.70	532.80	550.50	562.20
O-1 ²	321.00	355.20	443.70	443.70	443.70

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
O-10 ¹	\$1,616.40	\$1,616.40	\$1,740.60	\$1,740.60	\$1,865.10
O-9	1,432.50	1,432.50	1,491.90	1,491.90	1,616.40
O-8	1,367.70	1,367.70	1,432.50	1,432.50	1,491.90
O-7	1,119.30	1,184.10	1,184.10	1,243.50	1,367.70
O-6	870.30	870.30	870.30	900.00	1,041.90
O-5	746.10	769.50	810.60	864.60	929.40
O-4	692.70	739.80	781.20	816.90	852.60
O-3 ²	668.70	704.70	739.80	757.80	757.80
O-2 ²	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20
O-1 ²	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205				
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 ¹	\$1,865.10	\$1,989.30	\$1,989.30	\$2,113.80	\$2,113.80
O-9	1,616.40	1,740.60	1,740.60	1,865.10	1,865.10
O-8	1,557.00	1,616.40	1,681.50	1,681.50	1,681.50
O-7	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20	1,462.20
O-6	1,095.30	1,119.30	1,184.10	1,284.60	1,284.60
O-5	982.80	1,012.20	1,047.90	1,047.90	1,047.90
O-4	876.30	876.30	876.30	876.30	876.30
O-3 ²	757.80	757.80	757.80	757.80	757.80
O-2 ²	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20	562.20
O-1 ²	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70	443.70

"COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WHO HAVE BEEN CREDITED WITH OVER 4 YEARS' ACTIVE SERVICE AS ENLISTED MEMBERS"

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205					
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14
O-3	\$615.90	\$645.30	\$668.70	\$704.70	\$739.80	\$769.50
O-2	550.50	562.20	580.20	610.20	633.60	651.30
O-1	443.70	473.70	491.40	509.10	526.80	550.50

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205					
	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	\$769.50	\$769.50	\$769.50	\$769.50	\$769.50	\$769.50
O-2	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30	651.30
O-1	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50	550.50

(2) Chapter 5 is amended as follows:

(A) By adding the following new section:
 "§ 311. Special pay: continuation pay for physicians and dentists who extend their service on active duty"

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as appropriate, an officer of the Army or Navy in the Medical Corps, an officer of the Air Force who is designated as a medical officer or dental officer, or a medical or dental officer of the Public Health Service who—

"(1) is serving on active duty in a critical specialty designated by the Secretary;

"(2) has completed any other definitive active duty obligation that he has under law or regulation; and

"(3) executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for at least one additional year;

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 203(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

"WARRANT OFFICERS"

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
W-4	\$474.60	\$509.10	\$509.10	\$520.80	\$544.50	\$568.20	\$591.90
W-3	431.40	468.00	468.00	473.70	479.70	514.80	544.50
W-2	377.70	408.60	408.60	420.30	443.70	468.00	485.70
W-1	315.00	361.20	361.20	390.90	408.60	426.30	443.70

Pay Grade	Years of service computed under section 205							
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	\$633.60	\$663.00	\$686.70	\$704.70	\$728.10	\$752.10	\$810.60	\$810.60
W-3	562.20	580.20	597.60	615.90	639.60	663.00	686.70	686.70
W-2	503.10	520.80	538.80	556.20	573.90	597.60	597.60	597.60
W-1	462.00	479.70	497.40	514.80	532.80	532.80	532.80	532.80

"ENLISTED MEMBERS"

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205						
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
E-9 ³	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	\$539.10
E-8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	\$452.40	465.00
E-7	\$284.40	\$340.80	\$353.40	\$366.00	\$378.30	390.30	402.60
E-6	245.10	297.60	309.90	322.50	335.10	347.10	359.70
E-5	211.50	260.70	273.00	285.00	303.90	316.20	328.50
E-4	177.90	223.20	235.50	254.10	266.70	266.70	266.70
E-3	128.70	179.70	192.30	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60
E-2	106.20	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80
E-1	102.30	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20
E-1 (under 4 months)	95.70	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Pay grade	Years of service computed under section 205							
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9 ³	\$551.40	\$564.30	\$576.60	\$589.20	\$601.20	\$632.70	\$694.20	\$694.20
E-8	477.30	489.90	502.20	514.50	527.10	558.30	620.10	620.10
E-7	415.50	434.10	446.40	458.70	465.00	496.20	558.30	558.30
E-6	378.30	390.30	402.60	409.20	409.20	409.20	409.20	409.20
E-5	340.80	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10	347.10
E-4	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70	266.70
E-3	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60	204.60
E-2	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80	148.80
E-1	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20	136.20

¹ While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is \$2,332.20 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

² Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as enlisted members.

³ While serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Senior Enlisted Adviser of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, or Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is \$844.20 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title."

may be paid not more than four months basic pay at the rate applicable to him when he executes that agreement for each additional year that he agrees to remain on active duty. Pay under this section shall be paid in equal yearly installments in each additional year covered by an agreement to remain on active duty. However, in meritorious cases, the pay may be paid in fewer installments if the Secretary determines it to be in the best interest of the officer.

"(b) An officer who does not serve on active duty for the entire period for which he was paid under this section shall refund that percentage of the payment that the unexpired part of the period is of the total period for which the payment was made."

(B) By inserting the following item in the analysis:
 "311. Special pay: continuation pay for physicians and dentists who extend their service on active duty."

(3) Section 403(f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) A member of a uniformed service without dependents who is in pay grade E-4 (four or more years' service), or above, is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters while he is in a travel or leave status between permanent duty stations, including time granted as delay en route or proceed time, when he is not assigned to quarters of the United States."

(4) Section 407(a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided by subsections (b) and (c) of this section, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member of a uniformed service—

"(1) whose dependents make an authorized move in connection with his change of permanent station;

"(2) whose dependents are covered by section 405a(a) of this title; or

"(3) without dependents, who is transferred to a permanent station where he is not assigned to quarters of the United States;

is entitled to a dislocation allowance equal to his basic allowance for quarters for one month as provided for a member of his pay grade and dependency status in section 403 of this title. For the purposes of this subsection, a member whose dependents may not make an authorized move in connection with a change of permanent station is considered a member without dependents."

SEC. 2 (a) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The text of section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force may not be recomputed to reflect any increase in the rates of basic pay for members of the armed forces. In this section, 'Index' means the Consumer Price Index (all items, United States city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall determine monthly the percent by which the index has increased over that used as the basis (base index) for the most recent adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under this subsection. If the Secretary determines that, for three consecutive months, the amount of the increase is at least 3 percent over the base index, the retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the armed forces who became entitled to that pay before the first day of the third calendar month beginning after the end of those three months shall, except as provided in subsection (c), be increased, effective on that day, by the highest percent of increase in the index during those months, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

"(c) Notwithstanding subsection (b), if a member or former member of an armed force becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay based on rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37 that became effective after the last day of the month of the base index, his retired pay or retainer pay shall be increased on the effective date of the next adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under subsection (b) only by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) that the new base index exceeds the index for the calendar month immediately before that in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which his retired pay or retainer pay is based became effective.

"(d) If a member or former member of an armed force becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on or after the effective date of an adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay under subsection (b) but before the effective date of the next increase in the rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37, his retired pay or retainer pay shall be increased, effective on the date he becomes entitled to that pay, by the percent (adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent) that the base index exceeds the index for the calendar month immediately before that in which the rates of monthly basic pay on which his retired pay or retainer pay is based became effective."

(2) Section 1402 is amended—

(A) by inserting "increased by any applicable adjustments in that pay under section 1401a of this title after he initially became entitled to that pay," after "retired," in subsection (d); and

(B) by adding the following subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a member covered by that subsection may elect, upon his release from active duty, to have his retired pay or retainer pay—

"(1) computed according to the formula set forth in subsection (a) but using the rate

of basic pay under which his retired pay or retainer pay was computed when he entered on active duty; and

"(2) increased by any applicable adjustments in that pay under section 1401a of this title after he initially became entitled to that pay."

(3) The first sentence of section 1436(a) is amended by inserting "but without regard to any increase in that pay to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index" after "that pay" and before the period.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1401a(d) of title 10, United States Code, a person who is a member or former member of an armed force on the date of enactment of this Act and who became, or hereafter becomes, entitled to retired pay or retainer pay after November 30, 1966, but before the effective date of the next increase after July 1, 1966, in the rates of monthly basic pay prescribed by section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is entitled to have his retired pay or retainer pay increased by 3.7 percent, effective as of the date of his entitlement to that pay.

SEC. 3. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1401 is amended by adding to footnote 4 of the table therein a sentence to read as follows: "For an enlisted person who has served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, or sergeant major of the Marine Corps, compute at the highest rate of basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if that rate is higher than the rate authorized by the table."

(2) Section 3991 is amended by amending footnote 3 of the table therein to read as follows: "Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement, or if the member has served as sergeant major of the Army, compute at the highest basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if such basic pay is greater."

(3) Clause (2) of section 6326(c) is amended to read as follows: "(2) unless otherwise entitled to higher pay, is entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the basic pay of the pay grade in which he was serving on the day before retirement, or if he has served as senior enlisted advisor of the Navy or as sergeant major of the Marine Corps, he shall be entitled to retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the highest basic pay to which he was entitled while so serving, if that rate is higher."

(4) The first sentence of section 6330(c) is amended to read as follows: "Each member who is transferred to the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve under this section is entitled when not on active duty, to retainer pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the basic pay that he received at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of active service in the armed forces, except that in the case of a member who has served as senior enlisted advisor of the Navy or sergeant major of the Marine Corps, retainer pay shall be computed on the basis of the highest basic pay to which he was entitled while so serving, if that basic pay is higher than the basic pay received at the time of transfer."

(5) Section 8991 is amended by amending footnote 3 of the table therein to read as follows: "Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement, or if the member has served as chief master sergeant of the Air Force, compute at the highest basic pay applicable to him while he so served, if such basic pay is greater."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (50 App. U.S.C. 2203) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. For the duration of this Act, section 403(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out that part of the table which prescribes monthly basic allowances for quarters for enlisted members in pay grades E-1, E-2, E-3, and E-4 (four

years' or less service) and inserting in place thereof the following new table:

"Pay grade"	Without dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	3 or more dependents
E-4 (4 years or less service).....	\$60.00	\$90.60	\$90.60	\$105.00
E-3.....	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00
E-2.....	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00
E-1.....	60.00	60.00	90.60	105.00"

SEC. 5 (a) Section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (66 Stat. 80; 70 Stat. 114), is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "Any officer who was retired for age or length of service under laws in effect prior to October 1, 1949, and who was entitled, under those laws, to count inactive service in the computation of his retired or retirement pay shall hereafter be entitled to count such inactive service in the computation of his retired or retirement pay to the same extent as if he had been retired after October 1, 1949, but prior to June 1, 1958. However, the preceding sentence does not apply to an officer whose retired pay is computed under paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (ch. 413, 56 Stat. 368) or under the third proviso of section 5 of the Act of July 31, 1935 (ch. 422, 49 Stat. 507), as amended by section 3 of the Act of June 13, 1940 (ch. 344, 54 Stat. 380)."

(b) To accrue rights, under this section, a person who is entitled to retired pay on the effective date of this Act must file an application with the Secretary of the military department concerned.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who is entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on September 30, 1967, shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day plus an increase of 4.5 per centum in the total of his pay and allowances:

(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member or former member of a uniformed service who initially becomes entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on October 1, 1967, shall be entitled to have that pay computed using the rates of basic pay prescribed by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 8. This Act becomes effective as of October 1, 1967. However, a member, except as provided in section 7 of this Act, is not entitled to any increases in his pay and allowances under section 1 or section 4 for any period before the date of enactment of this Act unless he is on active duty on the date of enactment of this Act. In addition, a member of the National Guard or a member of a Reserve Component of a uniformed service who is in a drill pay status on the effective date of this Act is entitled to have any compensation to which he has become entitled under section 206 of title 37, United States Code, after September 30, 1967, computed under the rates of basic pay prescribed by section 1(1) of this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upwards, the President shall be required to concurrently direct and place into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

(b) Adjustments in the various tables establishing the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services as authorized by the preceding section shall be made in such manner as the President directs and shall have the force and effect of statute, provided that such adjustments shall:

(1) provide personnel of the uniformed services with an overall average increase in regular compensation which equates to that provided General Schedule employees, and

(2) carry the same effective date as that applying to the compensation adjustments provided General Schedule employees.

(c) For the purposes of this section, "regular compensation" means basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances (either in cash or in kind), and the tax advantage on those allowances.

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On pages 13 and 14, delete section 9 in its entirety and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 9. (a) Effective January 1, 1968, and unless otherwise provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, whenever the General Schedule of compensation for Federal classified employees as contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, is adjusted upward, there shall immediately be placed into effect a comparable upward adjustment in the monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services by section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code.

"(b) Adjustments in the various tables establishing the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services as required by the preceding paragraph shall have the force and effect of statute, and such adjustments shall:

"(1) provide all personnel of the uniformed services with an overall average increase in regular compensation which equates to that provided General Schedule employees, and

"(2) carry the same effective date as that applying to the compensation adjustments provided General Schedule employees.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, 'regular compensation' means basic pay, quarters and subsistence allowances (either in cash or in kind), and the tax advantage on those allowances."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 3, line 8, after the word "Medical" insert the words "or dental".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the

gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Do I understand that this bill adopts the 4.5-percent increase provided for class act employees in the recently approved pay legislation?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Not the 6 percent for postal employees?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is 4.5 percent, not 6 percent?

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is correct. It is 4.5 on his overall pay, which actually is 5.6 percent of his base pay.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this bill for the reasons I have previously stated. I am absolutely opposed to the two automatic increases that are provided in this bill, just as I was opposed to the two automatic increases provided in the bill now pending before the other body with respect to class act and postal employees. I cannot support a pay bill that places a huge mortgage on the unknown economic future of this country.

It has been my hope that somewhere along the line this Congress would come to its senses in the matter of spending. I warn that this will be another contribution to inflation. There are 89 Members of the House who took this into consideration in their votes against the civilian pay increase bill.

Mr. Chairman, the sacred sacrifices of the honored dead are used here as the reason for this legislation. It might be well to note that some 14,000 American fighting men in Vietnam made the service a "lifelong" career—only because their lives ended there in the service of our country.

To these men, and to those who at this hour give their lives in war, a pay raise is of little consequence.

So let us reason this issue here today in terms of the living, for all of them and all of us share in the fiscal realities and future of this deeply indebted Nation.

It would be grotesque gratitude to pay our debt to our fighting men by providing that for those who return it will be to a land of galloping inflation.

There is no reason, in poetry or prose, that will excuse abandoning our fiscal responsibilities to emotionalism.

I say once again, and in conclusion, that it is the height of financial irresponsibility to provide an immediate pay raise for civilian Federal employees and the military, and then, without regard to economic and fiscal conditions, provide for two additional and automatic increases in the next 2 years.

Congress will meet next year and it will meet again in 1969. Let us then determine whether there should be pay increases for the Government's civilian employees and its military forces.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 15, after line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 10. Section 410 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection.

"(c) Under regulations to be prescribed

by the Secretary of Defense and by the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), a member of an armed force who, upon completion of a tour of duty in an area described in section 310(a) (2) of this title, is authorized to use leave accrued to him under section 701 of title 10, is entitled to be transported at the expense of the United States to his home of record for the purposes of that leave and thence to his assigned duty station. However, no member is entitled to transportation at the expense of the United States under this section for travel outside the United States unless he is a bona fide resident of the place outside the United States that is selected by him under this section."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend very sincerely the members of this committee and especially the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services because they have been stalwarts on behalf of the servicemen of this country.

When I introduced a bill on this subject matter, the chairman very promptly was sympathetic and referred the bill to a subcommittee and the committee spent some time on it.

I also know that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] has worked faithfully and diligently on this but they were not able to properly analyze the bill and arrive at an agreement for the amendment before the bill now under consideration was reported out of the committee. But I think the subject covered by my amendment is something that needs to be taken to conference and I believe it is something very worthwhile and very meritorious.

The purpose of the amendment is clear on its face. The amendment would, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, provide service personnel returning to the United States upon completion of a tour of duty in an area in which they were entitled to the receipt of hostile-fire pay, the right to receive transportation at the expense of the United States to their home and thence to their new duty station.

The language of the amendment does not apply to service personnel returning from Vietnam who are scheduled for immediate separation from active duty, because such personnel are already entitled to transportation to their home upon separation from active service.

Service personnel returning from Vietnam all wish to go home to see their families. Personnel being separated from service have this entitlement, whereas service personnel scheduled to continue in an active-duty status do not receive Government transportation in order to permit them to visit their families.

The amendment would authorize transportation for an estimated 400,000 service personnel per year, at an estimated annual cost of \$40 million.

I do not think we are doing nearly enough for the one-fourth of 1 percent of Americans who are in Vietnam. When only one out of 400 is in Vietnam, surely the other 399 can at least provide them with their transportation to their home after they return. I especially have in mind those in the lower ranks who simply are unable to save any money on the low salaries that they receive. Those in the

lower grades also are denied transportation funds for their families when they are in the United States. Air Force regulations provide as follows:

Personnel of all the uniformed services in pay grade E-4 (AIC) with less than four years' service and lower pay grades are not entitled to transportation of dependents at Government expense. The reason for denying transportation of dependents and household goods of these members is the limited amount of money made available by Congress.

In other words, if there is a shortage of money, the attitude is, take it off of the lower grades.

The only way we can be sure that the services will use some of their funds to help provide transportation for the one out of 400 of us in Vietnam is to provide it in this bill. We provide a trip home each year for the members in the Peace Corps and for the Job Corps members; surely we can do the same thing for those returning from Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, we are going to accept the gentleman's amendment.

I understand that these men who come from a hostile-fire area who are not being separated, have to pay for the trip back home before they are assigned to the next tour of duty.

Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept this amendment and to try to work out something in conference.

I understand the intent of the gentleman and the committee wants to work with him. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, so far as we are concerned, we accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's support very much.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that I never saw this amendment until a few minutes ago. Therefore, I have not had an opportunity to analyze it. I do not know who would be eligible nor what the leave status would have to be or how much transportation would be provided.

Did I understand, from hearing the amendment read, that the amendment would only have application to payment of transportation to the veteran's home?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is true. That change was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I think it is a good change.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, I have not had a chance to study the amendment. Certainly, anyone who is exposed to hostile fire should be entitled to have his transportation to his home paid for by the Government.

I am willing to go along with the chairman of the committee in accepting the amendment at this time, but I would like to study it and analyze it before we go to conference.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13510) to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 952, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 386, nays 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—386

Abbott	Button	Ellberg
Abernethy	Byrne, Pa.	Erlenborn
Adair	Byrnes, Wis.	Esch
Adams	Cabell	Eshleman
Addabbo	Cahill	Evans, Colo.
Albert	Carey	Fallon
Anderson, Ill.	Carter	Farbstein
Anderson, Tenn.	Casey	Fascell
Andrews, Ala.	Cederberg	Feighan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Celler	Findley
Annunzio	Chamberlain	Fino
Arends	Clancy	Flood
Ashbrook	Clark	Flynt
Ashley	Clausen,	Foley
Ayres	Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.
Baring	Clawson, Del.	Ford,
Barrett	Cleveland	William D.
Bates	Collier	Fraser
Battin	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Belcher	Conable	Friedel
Bennett	Conte	Fulton, Pa.
Berry	Conyers	Fulton, Tenn.
Betts	Corbett	Galifianakis
Bevill	Cowger	Gallagher
Blester	Cramer	Gardner
Bingham	Culver	Garmatz
Blackburn	Cunningham	Gathings
Blanton	Curtis	Gettys
Blatnik	Daddario	Gialmo
Boland	Daniels	Gibbons
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Gilbert
Bolton	de la Garza	Gonzalez
Bow	Delaney	Goodell
Brademas	Dellenback	Goodling
Brasco	Denney	Gray
Bray	Dent	Green, Oreg.
Brinkley	Derwinski	Green, Pa.
Brock	Devine	Griffiths
Brooks	Dingell	Grover
Brotzman	Dole	Gubser
Brown, Mich.	Donohue	Gude
Brown, Ohio	Dorn	Gurney
Broyhill, N.C.	Dow	Hagan
Broyhill, Va.	Dowdy	Haley
Buchanan	Downing	Hall
Burke, Fla.	Dulski	Halleck
Burke, Mass.	Duncan	Halpern
Burleson	Dwyer	Hamilton
Burton, Calif.	Eckhardt	Hammer-
Burton, Utah	Edmondson	schmidt
Bush	Edwards, Ala.	Hanley
	Edwards, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho
	Edwards, La.	Hansen, Wash.

Hardy	Mills	Satterfield
Harrison	Minish	Saylor
Harsha	Mink	Schadeberg
Harvey	Minshall	Scherle
Hathaway	Mize	Scheuer
Hays	Monagan	Schneebell
Hechler, W. Va.	Montgomery	Schweiker
Heckler, Mass.	Moore	Schwengel
Helstoski	Moorhead	Scott
Henderson	Morgan	Selden
Hicks	Morris, N. Mex.	Shelley
Holland	Mosher	Shriver
Horton	Moss	Sikes
Hosmer	Multer	Sisk
Howard	Murphy, Ill.	Skubitz
Hull	Murphy, N.Y.	Slack
Hungate	Myers	Smith, Calif.
Hunt	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Hutchinson	Nedzi	Smith, N.Y.
Ichord	Nelsen	Smith, Okla.
Irwin	Nichols	Snyder
Jacobs	Nix	Springer
Jarman	O'Hara, Ill.	Stafford
Joelson	O'Konski	Staggers
Johnson, Calif.	Olsen	Stanton
Johnson, Pa.	O'Neal, Ga.	Steed
Jonas	O'Neill, Mass.	Steiger, Ariz.
Jones, Ala.	Ottinger	Steiger, Wis.
Jones, N.C.	Passman	Stephens
Karsten	Patman	Stratton
Karth	Patten	Stubblefield
Kastenmeier	Pelly	Sullivan
Kazen	Pepper	Taft
Kee	Perkins	Talcott
Keith	Pettis	Taylor
Kelly	Philbin	Teague, Calif.
King, Calif.	Pickle	Teague, Tex.
King, N.Y.	Pike	Thompson, Pa.
Kirwan	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Kleppe	Poage	Tiernan
Kluczynski	Poff	Tuck
Kornegay	Pool	Tunney
Kupferman	Price, Ill.	Udall
Kuykendall	Price, Tex.	Ullman
Kyros	Pryor	Van Deerlin
Laird	Pucinski	Vander Jagt
Landrum	Purell	Vanik
Langen	Quile	Vigorito
Latta	Quillen	Waggonner
Leggett	Rallsback	Waldie
Lennon	Randall	Walker
Lloyd	Reed	Wampler
Long, Md.	Reid, Ill.	Watkins
Lukens	Reid, N.Y.	Watson
McCarthy	Reifel	Watts
McClary	Reinecke	Whalen
McClure	Resnick	Whalley
McClulloch	Reuss	White
McDade	Rhodes, Ariz.	Whitener
McDonald,	Rhodes, Pa.	Whitten
Mich.	Rivers	Whitall
McEwen	Roberts	Wiggins
McMillan	Robison	Williams, Pa.
Macdonald,	Rodino	Wilson, Bob
Mass.	Rogers, Colo.	Wilson,
MacGregor	Rogers, Fla.	Charles H.
Machen	Ronan	Winn
Mahon	Rooney, N.Y.	Wolf
Mailliard	Rooney, Pa.	Wyatt
Marsh	Rosenthal	Wydler
Mathias, Calif.	Rostenkowski	Wylie
Mathias, Md.	Roth	Wyman
Matsunaga	Roudebush	Yates
May	Roush	Young
Mayne	Roybal	Zablocki
Meeds	Rumsfeld	Zion
Meskill	Ryan	Zwach
Michel	St Germain	
Miller, Ohio	Sandman	

NAYS—2

Davis, Wis.

Gross

NOT VOTING—44

Ashmore	Fuqua	Morton
Aspinall	Hanna	O'Hara, Mich.
Bell	Hawkins	Pollock
Boggs	Hébert	Rarick
Broomfield	Herlong	Riegle
Brown, Calif.	Holifield	Ruppe
Cohelan	Jones, Mo.	St. Onge
Corman	Kyl	Stuckey
Dawson	Lipscomb	Tenzer
Dickinson	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	McFall	Utt
Everett	Madden	Williams, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	Willis
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Wright
Fountain	Morse, Mass.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lipscomb for, with Mr. Martin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Herlong.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Fuqua.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was not present in the House when my name was called. I therefore cannot qualify. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 888, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 888), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, BOLAND, NATCHER, BOW, JONAS, and LAIRD.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FLOOD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and

Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 831)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) "making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 60, 67, 68, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 26, 53, 62, 63, 65, 66, 70, and 72, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,677,907,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$82,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$79,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Provided further, That no part of this appropriation for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools shall be available to carry out the provisions of legislation for this purpose enacted after June 30, 1967".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$63,937,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$164,663,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including \$35,000,000 for dental facilities as authorized by subsections (2) and (3) of said section"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$27,942,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$54,234,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$63,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$58,814,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$53,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$100,168,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,912,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 52, 55, 56, 61, 64, and 69.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
NORRIS COTTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower administration

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$385,497,000 for "Manpower development and training activities," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$394,997,000 as proposed by the House. It was not the intention of the conferees, in agreeing to the lower figure, to ban the use of this appropriation for the training of prison inmates. The conferees are agreed that health services for trainees under section 202(k) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1952, as amended, should be furnished under the regular Vocational Rehabilitation Program. Vocational Rehabilitation appropriations should be used for providing these services to all MDT trainees. This is the most efficient way of providing for the whole group including those who would otherwise qualify for VR services.

Wage and labor standards

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: Appropriate \$4,429,000 for "Bureau of Labor Standards, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the House instead of \$4,467,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$500,000 of the appropriation be for the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped as proposed by the Senate instead of \$462,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$66,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$66,225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate pertaining to the location of a laboratory.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10: Appropriate \$1,677,907,000 for "Elementary and secondary educational activities" instead of \$1,645,707,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,696,707,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that \$208,750,000 of the appropriation be for supplementary educational centers and services as proposed by the House instead of \$213,750,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that \$82,200,000 of the appropriation be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for equipment and minor remodeling under title III of the National Defense Education Act instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$96,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that allotments under sections 302(a) and 305 for equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of \$79,200,000 for grants to States instead of \$47,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$88,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike language proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 13: Appropriate \$439,137,000 for "School assistance in federally affected areas" as proposed by the House instead of \$472,937,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide that \$416,200,000 of the appropriation shall be for payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950, as amended, as

proposed by the House instead of \$450,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and insert language proposed by the Senate with a technical amendment which will exempt the purposes of carrying out section 7 of the Act of September 30, 1950 from the limitation imposed by the language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$13,500,000 for the Teacher Corps instead of \$18,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate \$156,500,000 for "Libraries and community services" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$155,500,000 as proposed by the House, and provide that \$5,000,000 of the appropriation shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$53,400,000 for "Educational improvement for the handicapped" as proposed by the House instead of \$58,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that funds made available in the 1967 "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968.

Amendment No. 19: Authorizes \$100,000,000 for "Participation sales authorizations" and appropriates \$925,000 for "Payment of participation sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration

Amendments Nos. 20 through 26: Appropriate \$311,550,000 for "Grants for rehabilitation services and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of \$312,550,000 as proposed by the Senate; delete the earmarking of \$1,000,000 for State planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs proposed by the Senate; and provide that \$3,850,000 of the appropriation is for grants with respect to workshops and rehabilitation facilities under section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as proposed by the House instead of \$4,850,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that planning for a research and training center in the Chicago area should not be delayed and will expect that not to exceed \$200,000 of these funds be utilized for that purpose.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$63,937,000 for "Research and training" instead of \$62,440,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,484,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$5,319,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of \$5,469,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$164,663,000 for "Health manpower education and utilization" instead of \$164,163,000 as proposed by the House and \$164,913,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Provides that \$35,000,000 of the appropriation for "Construction of health educational facilities" shall be for construction and modernization of teaching facilities for the training of dentists as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$27,942,000 for "Chronic diseases" instead of \$27,504,000 as proposed by the House and \$32,692,000 as proposed by the Senate. In general, the conferees are agreed on the desirability of the purposes of the Senate increase but are also agreed that a large part of the activities for which the increase of

over \$5,000,000 was earmarked is so closely related to activities financed under "Regional medical programs" that they would more properly be administered by the National Institutes of Health under that appropriation. With this in mind, the managers on the part of the House agreed to \$4,500,000 of the Senate increase for "Regional medical programs". It will be expected that the activities for which the Senate increase for "Chronic diseases" was earmarked be performed under the appropriation "Regional medical programs" to the maximum extent determined to be feasible by the National Institutes of Health.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$41,750,000 for "Urban and industrial health" instead of \$41,594,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,194,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$156,000 over the amount proposed by the House is earmarked for the Arctic Health Research Center.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34: Appropriate \$54,234,000 for "Community health services" instead of \$51,234,000 as proposed by the House and \$61,234,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$18,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for grants for facilities pursuant to part C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to the appropriation "Community health services" from the appropriation "Community mental health resource support" pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$63,230,000 for "Hospitals and medical care" instead of \$62,830,000 as proposed by the House and \$63,633,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$183,356,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$192,356,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$167,954,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$177,954,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$30,307,000 for the National Institute of Dental Research as proposed by the House instead of \$32,307,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$143,954,000 for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases as proposed by the House instead of \$147,204,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$128,633,000 for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness as proposed by the House instead of \$135,633,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$94,422,000 for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases as proposed by the House instead of \$98,922,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$160,284,000 for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences as proposed by the House instead of \$164,284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$68,621,000 for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development as proposed by the House instead of \$74,621,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate \$58,814,000 for "Regional medical programs" instead of \$54,314,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,314,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that \$53,900,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1969, instead of \$49,400,000 as proposed by the House and \$59,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$17,289,000 for "Environmental health sciences" as proposed by the House instead of \$20,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$81,141,000 for "General research and services, National Institutes of Health," as proposed by the House instead of \$84,641,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$35,000,000 for "Grants for construction of health research facilities" as proposed by the House instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Provides for the transfer to "General research support grants" of \$61,700,000 of appropriations available to the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$500,000 for the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences as proposed by the House instead of \$725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which proposes language to make the funds appropriated to the John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences available until December 31, 1968.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54: Update citation to enabling legislation as proposed by the Senate, and appropriate \$100,168,000 for "Community mental health resource support" instead of \$50,168,000 as proposed by the House and \$110,168,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will earmark \$45,000,000, instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for construction to remain available until June 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides language authorizing transfers of funds to "Community mental health resource support" from "Community health services" pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate \$19,912,000 for National Library of Medicine instead of \$18,662,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,162,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides that \$5,250,000 of the amount appropriated shall remain available until June 30, 1969, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$10,715,000 for "Buildings and facilities" as proposed by the House instead of \$15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds for the Appalachian Health Field Station were not agreed to. However, this action was without prejudice to the project; in fact, it is recognized as a No. 1 priority item for the 1969 budget, and, if firm assurances can be given that the architectural-engineering plans for the Government facility on leased land will be finished prior to June 1968, the conferees are agreed that a supplemental request for 1968 will be given favorable consideration.

Amendment No. 60: Restores "Participation sales authorization" of \$15,000,000 and appropriation of \$250,000 for "Payment of sales insufficiencies" as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which pro-

vides technical language determined to be necessary for the effective use of the revolving funds "Health professions education fund" and the "Nurse training fund" under which student loans are made.

Welfare administration

Amendments Nos. 62 and 63: Appropriate \$525,000 for "Assistance for repatriated U.S. nationals" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$432,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which strikes language proposed by the House and inserts similar language proposed by the Senate regarding payments to States under certain titles of the Social Security Act.

Administration on aging

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$18,450,000 for "Coordination and development of programs for the aging" as proposed by the Senate.

Special institutions

Amendment No. 66: Corrects printing error.

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$2,878,000 for "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the House instead of \$2,948,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$2,196,000 for "Gallaudet College, construction" as proposed by the House instead of \$2,312,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating \$7,139,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,739,000 as proposed by the House, and including language providing for a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$2,209,000 for "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates \$15,700,000 for "Foreign language training and area programs" as proposed by the House instead of \$16,300,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes authorization for carrying out the purposes of Public Law 89-698, the International Education Act of 1966. The conferees will expect that the cost of administering the other programs provided for by this appropriation be borne, as it has in the past, by the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education."

General provisions

There has been fear on the part of some that the variable cost sharing required of research grantees under the Department's application of section 203 might result in the allocation of these funds on some standard other than the competence and distinction of the research scholar or scientist concerned, and the adequacy of facilities available to him and his coworkers for a proposed project, all weighed solely in relation to the potential benefit of the research to the American people. The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have been assured that variable cost sharing has not resulted in any other standard, and all information on the subject available to the committees confirms

these assurances. However, there is a potential danger that the conferees caution the Department to be vigilant in avoiding.

TITLE VII—U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

The bill as it passed both the House and Senate provides the sum of \$90,000 for a revision of the current master plan of the U.S. Soldiers' Home. It has come to the conferees' attention that the National Capital Planning Commission's "Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital," dated February 1967, would take two parcels of land from the U.S. Soldiers' Home.

It is the view of the conferees that no land should be taken from the Soldiers' Home pending completion and study of the revision of the U.S. Soldiers' Home master plan provided for in the bill.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 72: Inserts language proposed by the Senate in lieu of similar language proposed by the House.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
NEAL SMITH,
W. R. HULL, Jr.,
BOB CASEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request granted by the House on yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10196) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

Mr. FLOOD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, not having had an opportunity to see the conference report, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to advise me whether or not this 50-mile rider, the so-called Laird rider, has been agreed to by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I know whereof the gentleman speaks, but this is a conference report, and that was not before the conference, and it was not to be considered at this time.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was amendment No. 2 that would deal with the question of the appropriation of money for planning funds. Are those appropriations still in this report?

Mr. FLOOD. Appropriations for what?

Mr. MACHEN. For planning money for laboratory No. 2, and I believe that was amendment No. 2.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I say

to the gentleman from Maryland, we are here under a mandate of the House. We were told what to do by the House when this bill was recommitted, and the managers did exactly what the House told us to do—no more and no less, thank God—to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments which exceeded the budget requests therefor. There were 13 such amendments. The problem to which the gentleman refers was not included among the sacred 13, so we acted as the House ordered on those 13 amendments.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this conference report that the committee has submitted will have funds provided for planning laboratory No. 2 that must be built more than 50 miles from the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. There will be funds. I should not go on, because that was not subject to change by this conference, but I want to be gracious and courteous to my friend. He knows that is a rhetorical question, and he has the answer himself. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. MACHEN. I thank the gentleman. I am not certain on that. I have not had the opportunity to see the conference report.

Mr. FLOOD. It will be in the RECORD,

and the gentleman can spend the rest of the evening on it.

Mr. MACHEN. That will have been acted on by then.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct; but I can do nothing about it.

Mr. MACHEN. Hindsight is better than foresight.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not always agree with that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the "Laird rider." Would the gentleman be good enough to tell us what he means?

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in this bill that prohibits the building or planning for construction of the Pure Food and Drug Laboratory within a 50-mile radius of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield again, I thought perhaps he was alluding to the Laird proposal which provides \$40 million for the alleged extermination of rats.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF 2D CONFERENCE REPORT

[In thousands]

	Appropriation, 1967	Budget, 1968	House act, 1968	Senate act, 1968	1st conference report, Oct. 3, 1967 ¹	Pending conference report	Pending conference report compared with—				
							1967	Budget	House	Senate	1st conference
Department of Labor	\$638,220	\$652,973	\$635,024	\$625,562	\$625,524	\$625,524	-\$12,696	-\$27,449	-\$9,500	-\$38	-----
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:											
Office of Education	3,890,003	3,944,466	3,834,115	3,942,090	3,882,815	3,880,815	-9,188	-63,651	+46,700	-61,275	-\$2,000
NIH	1,123,162	1,187,750	1,174,424	1,252,225	1,197,399	1,178,924	+55,762	-28,124	+4,500	-73,301	-18,475
Other HEW	7,307,522	7,579,074	7,434,092	7,541,950	7,510,446	7,510,260	+202,738	-49,516	+76,168	-31,690	-186
Total, HEW	12,320,687	12,711,290	12,442,631	12,736,265	12,590,660	12,569,999	+249,311	-141,291	+127,368	-166,266	-20,661
Related agencies	57,657	59,883	59,833	59,833	59,833	59,833	+2,176	-50	-----	-----	-----
Total, Labor-HEW bill	13,016,564	13,424,146	13,137,488	13,421,660	13,276,017	13,255,356	+238,791	-168,790	+117,868	-166,304	-20,661

¹ Recommended by the House Oct. 4 with instructions to the managers on the part of the House "To insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments that exceed the budget request therefor."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my strong right arm, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees bring back to this House today a conference report that is in accordance in every detail to the instructions given to us on Wednesday, October 4. Although your conferees did not vote for these instructions but supported the original conference report, we felt dutybound to present the House position in the House-Senate conference this morning. The Senate realizing the problem and the seriousness in holding up this appropriation bill any longer, receded and agreed to the instructions given to the House conference members.

This conference report was agreed to unanimously by all House and Senate conferees with no exceptions being taken.

In view of the criticism I have received from some quarters regarding added cost to the Food and Drug Administration by requiring that their new laboratory not be built within a 50-mile radius of Washington, I would merely state that this

amendment has been accepted by all conferees. The statements that in requiring this to be built in Madison, Wis., we are incurring an additional cost of \$5 million are simply not true. In view of these false reports and also a committee report of the House Government Operations Committee dated last week, the chairman of the conference committee, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked the Assistant Secretary and Comptroller of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for an up-to-date report. This report, dated today, is as follows:

HON. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in response to your request for clarification of the cost differential associated with the construction of the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory Building No. 2 in Madison, Wisconsin, rather than in Beltsville, Maryland.

As you know this is a matter which was

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this to be a monolog. Of course, every Member of the House is quite aware of the situation.

Your managers have been in conference with the Senate conferees from early this morning until about 2 hours ago. We were there under your guns. You told us what to do.

I am very proud and happy to report we did exactly what you told us to do. We stood by our guns.

Believe it or not, on a bill for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, with 13 amendments you sent back in disagreement, the Senate receded on every single one of the 13 amendments. They total over \$20 billion below what was in the conference report that was recommitted.

Mr. Speaker, your managers would wish to emphasize that this bill is now about \$170 million under the budget.

The debate took place when we were here with the first conference report. I see no particular reason for me to gild the lily.

Mr. Speaker, the following table summarizes the action on this bill at each stage, as well as the 1967 appropriation and budget request for 1968, with pertinent comparisons:

explored by the House Committee on Government Operations. They have just issued a report on the subject which is critical of the cost estimates which were prepared by the Food and Drug Administration. They make reference to an earlier estimate which indicated that a location in the mid-west would increase cost by \$5.4 million and a later estimate which indicated the additional cost of locating the laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin, would be about \$1 million.

We have reviewed these estimates and have concluded that the original estimate of \$5.4 million is not supportable for the activities and plans presently proposed for lab no. 2, wherever it is located. I can find no precise estimate or breakdown of the \$1 million estimate prepared by FDA.

The elements which affect the initial cost of this facility as we see it are:

(1) *Construction cost.* The Boeckh construction cost index shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wisconsin, than the comparable figure for the Washington, D.C., area.

(2) *Size of facility.* The facility will house the same program and operation. Provision will have to be made for a limited amount of service and support space for a facility located on an independent site as distinguished from a site containing other FDA operations

such as Beltsville. It is estimated that this additional space would not exceed a net increase of one percent.

(3) *Moving personnel.* An initial cost for relocating personnel from the Washington area to Madison, Wisconsin, will have to be provided for. The extent of this cost is difficult to estimate because of the unpredictable nature of the problem. At best you can only guess at the number of staff that will move and the number that will be recruited locally. We have been provided with estimates ranging from \$338,000 to \$500,000 but have not endeavored to evaluate them.

We would conclude, therefore, that there is only a small net difference in construction between Madison and Beltsville which could be anywhere from zero to a one percent differential, plus or minus. There will be a limited initial cost associated with the transfer of staff. It is clear, therefore, that a \$5.4 million estimate is a gross overstatement, and it would appear that an estimate as high as \$1 million is certainly an outside figure. It is not possible at this stage of project development to supply more precise cost estimates. We are, of course, assuming that there will be no cost associated with land acquisition at either site.

If you have any further question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ JAMES F. KELLY,

Assistant Secretary, Comptroller.

Mr. Speaker, this report should lay to rest the question of the Laird rider for once and for all. I express my deep appreciation to the House and to all members of the Senate conference committee for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 10196 making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1968 is a good conference report. Conference spent more time on this HEW conference committee than on any previous HEW conference in my memory.

No one is totally happy with all of the details of this \$13.2 billion appropriation bill but, I think, under the circumstances, the best possible compromise was worked out and I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

The distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has ably outlined for you the details of the conference report. For my part I would like to take a little time to discuss in particular the National Institutes of Health which in August of this year celebrated its 80th anniversary in providing leadership in the fields of medical research.

Before discussing this, let me say that the Federal investment in medical research is one of the best investments this Congress makes in the future of our Nation and I am happy that this report contains no reductions from the NIH requests. I would rather see more emphasis placed on medical research than on the much touted moonshot because we have a lot of problems to clean up here on Earth before we start looking for added responsibilities on the Moon.

In medicine, Mr. Speaker, there are basically two major ways to combat disease: you can treat it when it occurs through what we might call custodial care, or you can try to prevent its occurrence in the first place through medical research in preventive medicine.

In my view, Federal priorities should be placed on medical research. By shifting the emphasis away from space research and concentrating more heavily on human research, Federal dollars will be far better spent.

One of the critical factors to take into consideration in this is the fact that providing enough beds and enough doctors could turn out to be a losing battle with our rapidly increasing population unless the primary allocation of Federal dollars goes into medical research.

Mr. Speaker, today we have doctor and nurse shortages with our present population. The problem will obviously be severely intensified in the future if we do not vigorously attack causes. Medical research gave us the Salk polio vaccine. Thanks to this amazing medical research triumph, polio in this country is fast becoming a rare disease. We have seen what the heart pump is capable of doing and we can speculate that additional research money provided in this bill will lead, in a few short years, to an artificial heart that can permanently be used to replace a diseased human heart.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the very great emphasis that I think should be placed on medical research, I would like to pay a special tribute to the leadership in this field that has been provided through the past eight decades by the National Institutes of Health and I would like to briefly outline some of the achievements of the National Institutes of Health during its long service to the country.

August 1967 marked the 80th year of service of the National Institutes of Health to the health and welfare of this Nation. Tracing its origin back to a one-room laboratory in the Marine hospital service, the history of NIH is the history of America's struggles with and triumphs over disease and disability.

I first joined the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee in 1953, and as a member of that subcommittee, it has been my privilege over the past 14 years to learn firsthand of many exciting advances in medicine which constituted important victories over today's major health problems.

Our Nation owes a debt it can never repay for the invaluable contributions made over the past eight decades by Federal scientists—often at great personal risk. These achievements—and many others made by non-Federal scientists working with NIH grant funds—have helped add 23 years to the average lifespan in this country since the beginning of the century.

Today, NIH provides 55 percent of all Federal support for medical research, and 36 percent of the Nation's total expenditure for medical research.

This vital role of NIH is in part due to the wholehearted support given it by Congress over the years. Key leaders in this support by Congress have been the late Frank Keefe from my State of Wisconsin and the late John Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

NIH, of course, owes much to the great scientists and scientist-administrators whose accomplishments are important milestones in modern medical history:

Dr. Joseph J. Kinyoun, the young Ma-

rine hospital service officer who in 1887 established his small laboratory on Staten Island for cholera research and which is now viewed in retrospect as the embryo National Institutes of Health;

Dr. Joseph Goldberger, whose recognition of pellagra as a dietary deficiency disease opened a new door to the modern science of nutrition;

Dr. Charles Armstrong, whose invaluable contributions to research in the infectious diseases covered 46 years;

Drs. Rolla E. Dyer, William H. Sebrell, Jr., and James A. Shannon, the Directors of NIH during the great postwar expansion, whose expert guidance helped NIH emerge from its role as a small Federal laboratory into the greatest single institution dedicated to advancing medical progress in the world today.

It is because of all these men and many others that our Nation has come out from under the shadow of European medicine in a few short decades into a position of undisputed world leadership in health. I can think of no other investment that this Nation has made that has paid off so handsomely in concrete accomplishments that have benefited so many. NIH—with a budget of little more than a billion dollars certainly is a billion-dollar success story.

NIH's earliest concerns, when it was still called the Hygienic Laboratory, were with the infectious diseases—afflictions which, we may be indeed thankful, we and our children need little fear. Along with the great wave of American immigration came the threat of deadly invasion from cholera, yellow fever, typhus, plague, and smallpox—names which are seldom spoken today in this country. The Laboratory made important contributions to developing means for protecting against, and finally ridding our Nation of, these terrible afflictions.

With the epidemic diseases largely under control, NIH turned its attention to the chronic ailments: heart disease, cancer, arthritis, blindness—the countless disorders which man is particularly heir to if he manages to survive through young adulthood. In these diseases, progress is seldom as dramatic as that made in combatting the infectious disorders. There is seldom an easily identifiable cause for which a vaccine can be developed. Such causes as there may be are usually highly elusive and subtle and may interact to produce the disease. Such problems must be approached on many different levels and through many different scientific disciplines. Sophisticated equipment and highly trained specialists—not only in the traditional biomedical fields, but in the physical and theoretical sciences as well—are essential if there is to be continued progress.

Mysteries as deep as the secret of life itself undoubtedly lie at the heart of many of the chronic ailments. Seeking ways to prevent and treat these disorders, NIH found itself rapidly growing, needing greatly expanded facilities, funds, and staff. Sophisticated management methods were instituted, replacing the easy informality of the Hygienic Laboratory.

A large number of supportive services,

including animal production and holding, the manufacture of specialized laboratory equipment, computer installations, elaborate safety procedures, specialized maintenance, and hundreds of other essential operations also contributed to the rapid postwar expansion of the NIH plant. The burgeoning grants operation, which today accounts for four-fifths of the NIH expenditure, required increasing numbers of persons for award handling, review, and management.

With such rapid expansion it is much to the credit of good leadership and administration that little inefficiency has characterized the NIH operations. Numerous investigations have generally wound up praising the agency and admiring its judicious use of a sizable portion of the public funds. And the Commission on Research of the American Medical Association recently recommended that the programs of NIH be recognized "for their contribution to the national biomedical research effort."

Among these contributions in the past decade have been the following discoveries:

In 1956, NIH scientists Drs. Herman M. Kalckar, Elizabeth P. Anderson, and Kurt J. Isselbacher announced their discovery of the cause of an often fatal metabolic disease of children called galactosemia. The disease, characterized by the inability of the child to tolerate milk in any form, can be treated simply by placing the child on a milk-free diet. However, early diagnosis is crucial. The discovery of an enzyme in normal persons which is lacking in galactosemia victims enabled the scientists to develop an accurate, simple diagnostic test for the disease.

In 1957, Drs. John Bozicevich, Jules Freund, and Joseph Bunim developed a rapid diagnostic test for rheumatoid arthritis. This painful joint disease can result in deformity and complete disability if not treated early. The new test shortens the diagnostic procedure from several days to a few minutes. The test makes use of a colloidal clay called Bentonite which seeks out a "rheumatoid factor" in the blood sample. If the Bentonite particles form microscopic clumps, the test is positive.

Transmission of monkey malaria to man through the bite of an infected mosquito was reported by Drs. Don E. Eyles, G. Robert Coatney, and Morton E. Getz in 1960, after Dr. Eyles and an assistant became accidentally infected during a routine inoculation of monkeys who had primate malaria. This finding upset the previously accepted theory that animal malaria could not be transmitted to man in the laboratory. The scientists predicted that further studies would prove that monkey malaria also could be transmitted to man in nature through mosquitoes. This prediction was borne out in 1965 when the same parasite that causes malaria in monkeys was found as the cause of malaria in a man hospitalized at NIH who had traveled in Malaya that summer.

Drs. Marshall W. Nirenberg and J. Heinrich Matthaei announced the partial cracking of the genetic code in 1961. The

code, basic to the systematic reproduction of all living matter, provides the means for storing and transmitting genetic information. The NIH scientists were able to illuminate the way information is coded into the cellular nucleic acids and used to direct the incorporation of specific amino acids into proteins. This discovery represented the first experimental demonstration of how protein is synthesized in the living cell.

In work announced this year the Nirenberg research team added convincing evidence to support that universality of the genetic code by demonstrating that the genetic transfer substance from a mammal, an amphibian, and a bacterium are all basically the same in their action to direct the manufacture of specific proteins.

The year 1966 was highlighted by the development of a promising experimental vaccine against rubella, commonly known as German measles, by Drs. Harry M. Meyer, Jr., and Paul D. Parkman. The major hazard of rubella is to unborn children whose mothers may be infected during pregnancy. Such children may be born mentally retarded, blind, deaf, or with congenital heart disease. And at the same time, these same investigators devised tests to determine immunity to this disease in pregnant women.

These are accomplishments of which NIH can indeed be proud, but this bureau has never been one to rest on its past achievements. NIH leadership has always felt that, as impressive as past victories have been, many great and difficult problems remain unsolved. Under dynamic and innovative leadership we have seen—and are seeing—many evidences of creative federalism at its best.

This is indeed fortunate, for today, especially, there is a tremendous amount of popular expectation and demand for medical miracles that will rival our spectacular accomplishments in outer space. Our news media have made much of experiments with artificial hearts, organ transplantation, new genetic discoveries, and numerous so-called cures for cancer, heart disease, and other major diseases which now constitute the leading causes of death and disability in America. Many persons are vocally dissatisfied with the pace of research breakthroughs in medicine, because they are unaware of the complexities of modern biomedical research.

NIH, I think, is well aware of these expectations. Its goals for the immediate future reflect a definite concern with the solution of health problems important to all Americans.

It is important, however, that we as laymen realize that further medical progress may be slower than we would like. Unlike the physical sciences, there is no general unified body of knowledge that encompasses the phenomena of life and the nature of disease and health.

Progress in the medical sciences is thus very much predicated upon the advance of fundamental knowledge and the development of broad theoretical concepts. Current biomedical research efforts, although conducted in a space age environ-

ment, rely to a great extent upon empiricism, much as did research in physics in its earlier stages. Major advances, therefore, often emerge uncontrollably and unpredictably.

Still, in a number of important areas, enough of this basic knowledge has been gained to make feasible research projects oriented toward specific problems. The planners at NIH, assisted by outside advisers, have devoted much effort in recent years to identifying these areas and to initiating national programs for their exploitation.

These areas include:

The search for drugs effective against leukemia, breast cancer, and other solid tumors;

The final proof for a viral link to human cancer—certain studies being conducted at the University of Wisconsin are aiding in this process;

Vaccines against an array of infectious diseases;

The control of kidney disease and the improvement of artificial kidneys;

The exploration of heart attack and the development of heart assist devices and total replacement by artificial hearts;

Control of hypertension;

The extension of organ transplant capability and the control of the associated immunologic rejection phenomena.

Additionally, NIH will in the future be expanding general research in areas considered critical to the achievement of national health objectives. These include: aging, human development, and mental retardation; environmental health; visual disorders; fertility control and population dynamics; pharmacology and toxicology; and biomedical engineering and computer research and technology.

Mr. Speaker, through its regional medical programs, now underway, NIH is also contributing to activities that will speed application of research findings for direct benefit of patients.

There are other problems of great interest which our conference committee decided should be the concern of the regional medical program. Members are fully aware of the fact that this legislative authority includes diseases related to heart, cancer, and stroke.

Chronic respiratory diseases, emphysema, chronic bronchitis, and others clearly meet this criteria. The problem of emphysema particularly is really alarming. Disability payments from OASDI funds to persons incapacitated by emphysema total \$90 million per year and are increasing rapidly. We are late now but we must begin immediately to control this health problem. The regional medical program must devote between \$1 and \$2 million this year to initiate a program of medical education in medical schools. Just as it is required that a member of the National Advisory Council of Regional Medical Program be competent in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of each of the diseases of reference, heart disease, cancer, and stroke, one should be added to provide expert information to the Council on emphysema. And most certainly cooperative arrangements with

appropriate voluntary health organizations are expected.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate on the original conference report on this bill on October 4, there was agreement that \$438,000 in the Public Health Service Chronic Disease Center could be used for a program of pediatric pulmonary centers and there was similar agreement in the framework of the Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases on a \$500,000 collaborative program on immunal therapy—skin cancer. It is my understanding that this agreement still prevails and that both these programs could be funded within the moneys now agreed on in this revised conference report.

For the coming year, this bill provides funds for the planning of an international conference center at NIH—a project long a dream of John E. Fogarty. As you know, I was determined that this dream should not pass with our esteemed colleague and was gratified by the support given my proposal for the planning of the center that will bear John Fogarty's name.

In passing H.R. 10196 the Members of the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—will once again demonstrate their grasp of opportunities in medical research and will have attempted to realize their vision of a better tomorrow through added funding of budget requests in the field of vital medical research.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress and indeed all Americans can be justly proud of the National Institutes of Health. Its direct contributions to research progress and its indirect achievements—through the support of the training of thousands of research scientists and the construction of millions of dollars worth of research facilities—are, in the final analysis, evidence of the soundness of the American people's investment in their own health and well-being.

And the successes of the past 80 years are only a prolog to things to come. The exciting promise of what medicine holds in store for our children and grandchildren leads me to speculate that tomorrow's most exciting headlines are less likely to concern the barren soil of the moon than they are to concern the gradual freeing of our people from the suffering and devastation of disability and disease.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to make an appeal to this House to restore the full funds needed to support the commitment made by the Congress to the school districts across the land in the form of Public Laws 874 and 815.

This legislation was enacted in response to the burden imposed upon our school districts by the presence of Federal installations. While Federal activities create additional school enrollments, Federal properties do not contribute property tax revenues to the areas in which they are located. Thus, the Federal Government, under Public Laws 874 and 815, recognized its responsibility to

these impacted areas and made provisions to compensate these school districts.

When this body considered the appropriation bill encompassing the 874-815 programs, \$416 million was appropriated, which is \$44 million less than what is needed to support all entitlements for fiscal year 1968 under this legislation.

I offered amendments to the supplemental appropriation bill to provide \$48 million of additional funds in support of Public Law 815 entitlement and \$20 million for entitlements under Public Law 874. These amendments would have enabled the Congress to fully meet its commitments to our burdened school districts but, unfortunately, they were rejected.

When the other body considered this matter it appropriated \$450 million which, though it exceeded the House appropriation by \$34 million, was, nevertheless, \$10 million less than what is needed to meet all entitlements.

In conference, the amount agreed upon was \$416 million which, as I stated previously, falls short of the mark by \$44 million.

If this figure is accepted, we will in effect be telling the school districts that we refuse to fully live up to our commitment and that they will have to water down their educational programs accordingly.

I regard this as a disgrace and a tragedy—a disgrace because we, the Congress, have failed to live up to our commitment; and a tragedy because our schoolchildren shall have to pay for our irresponsibility in the form of watered down programs.

Gentleman, I appeal to each and every one of you to avoid bringing such disgrace upon this esteemed body. I ask that the full appropriation of \$460 million be restored and sent to the Senate for approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Will the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania tell me what cuts, if any, have been made in the research and development funds for the National Institutes of Health?

Mr. FLOOD. Well, there was no cut made by this committee in any of the National Institutes. There were small cuts for two related programs—regional medical programs, and environmental health sciences—but we allowed the full budget request for every one of the National Institutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, there is a 7-percent increase over the budget of last year for the Institutes in this conference report. However, the add-ons of the other body were denied by this report as submitted. The 1968 budget as submitted and as approved by the House provides for a 7-percent increase for NIH, with the exception of two items, and the report as submitted to the House by this committee of conference is in

conformity with the budget requested by the President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the research items for NIH, the budget has been left intact?

Mr. FLOOD. I respond to the distinguished gentleman from Florida by saying "Yes."

Mr. PEPPER. I commend the able gentleman for that.

Mr. FLOOD. Further, Mr. Speaker, I might say to the Members of the House, concerning the distinguished gentleman from Florida, when the gentleman served in the other body and during the time during which he has served in this House of Representatives, I consider him to be one of our greatest extemporaneous speakers whom it has been my pleasure to hear either in the House or in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman and his lovely wife are very much interested in one of the programs involved in the activities which are carried on by the National Institutes of Health. I had the pleasure of being their guest at a national meeting which was sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Florida and his lovely wife.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I must confess surprise at the letter from HEW Comptroller James F. Kelly to Senator HILL concerning the proposed FDA Headquarters Laboratory No. 2 which was placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] in connection with the conference report on the Labor-HEW appropriation. However, I suppose that it should not have been unexpected, since this is simply another example of how FDA and HEW officials have repeatedly talked out of both sides of their mouths on this project in an attempt to play one congressional committee off against another. This history is amply documented by House Report No. 801, "FDA Procedures for the Selection of Laboratory Sites," which was prepared by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and adopted by the Committee on Government Operations without a dissenting vote.

Nevertheless, in order to set the record straight, I feel obligated to point out that the Office of the HEW Comptroller had provided the subcommittee information which was quite different from that provided to Senator HILL. The information provided to the subcommittee also contained relevant facts which were omitted in the letter to the Senator.

In the latter document, Mr. Kelly concluded that there would be only a small net difference in the construction costs for this facility between Beltsville, Md., and Madison, Wis., "which could be anywhere from zero to a 1-percent differential, plus or minus." In substantiation of this conclusion, he cites the Boeckh construction cost index, which he says "shows a slightly lower cost per square foot in Madison, Wis., than the com-

parable figure for the Washington, D.C., area." This same publication is cited in a letter of July 31, 1967, to a member of my subcommittee staff from Mr. Kelly's deputy, Mr. James B. Cardwell, to show "general construction costs at Madison as being about 1 percent lower than those for the Washington, D.C., area." However, Mr. Cardwell went on to say that:

The index in question relates only to general non-Federal office and commercial construction and not to specialized laboratories of the type at issue. At this time, we are not able to furnish you with an accurate estimate of what all of the cost differentials might be. Clearly, the Boeckh index is not in itself sufficient for this purpose.

Obviously, this is quite different from the impression created by Mr. Kelly in his letter to Senator HILL.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the July 31 letter from Mr. Cardwell be included in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

Furthermore a memorandum supplied to the subcommittee by Mr. Cardwell and dated August 15, 1967, contains the following statement concerning the cost of construction of Laboratory No. 2 in the Midwest:

Current rough cost indices (the Boeckh Appraisal Manual and the DOD Construction Cost Index) are so broad in their scope that there is no sound basis on which to estimate that an actual cost differential exists between the Beltsville site and the alternate site at Madison. The Boeckh index shows that it would be about three percent cheaper to construct the same brick and concrete building in Madison than in Washington. The Department of Defense Construction Cost Index shows construction in the State of Wisconsin to be ten percent higher than in Washington, D.C. Both of these cost indexes fail to make any adjustment for geographic differentials that may exist for the purchase and installation of fixed laboratory equipment. Since the cost index figures that are available do not agree in their conclusion and since specialized laboratory equipment is a major part of the total construction cost we are unable to reach any firm conclusion on construction cost differentials between the two geographic areas in question.

Again, this is quite different from the impression created by Mr. Kelly in his letter to Senator HILL. I think it is also significant that Mr. Kelly failed to make any mention of the fact that the Department of Defense Construction Cost Index showed construction in the State of Wisconsin to be 10 percent higher than in Washington, D.C.

There are other instances in which Mr. Kelly's letter to the Senator is not in accordance with information previously supplied to our subcommittee by his office. For example, his letter states that for the initial cost of relocating personnel from Washington to Madison, "We have been provided with estimates ranging from \$338,000 to \$500,000, but have not endeavored to evaluate them." On this same point, however, the August 15 memo to our subcommittee states that because of the passage of the Administrative Expenses Act, it would appear that the 1966 estimate of \$500,000 is a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the foregoing facts are sufficient to show that

HEW, and particularly the Office of the Comptroller, have been playing games with the committees of the Congress. However, there is one other matter in connection with this proposed laboratory about which I feel some obligation to set the record straight.

In the RECORD for October 25, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] made a statement alleging that the report of the Government Operations Committee "is completely inaccurate with respect to the cost estimates for the proposed Madison, Wis., site for the Food and Drug Administration Laboratory No. 2."

Mr. Speaker, the report makes it quite clear that the estimates referred to are not the committee's but were in fact prepared by FDA for the House Appropriations Committee.

Moreover, the report states that the committee is not necessarily endorsing the accuracy of FDA's original estimate that it would cost \$5.4 million more to construct this facility in the Midwest than in the Washington area or a later revision of that estimate reducing the differential to \$1 million.

I believe the following quote from the findings of the report makes this point quite clearly:

The Committee wishes to emphasize that it is citing FDA's cost estimate only to illustrate the inconsistency of FDA's position and its apparent lack of concern for economy and efficiency. In so doing, the Committee is not endorsing the accuracy of the estimate. In fact, since the Subcommittee's hearings, FDA has changed its original estimate and now maintains that the initial cost differential between Beltsville and the alternative site at Madison, Wis., would be about \$1 million rather than \$5,400,000. However, for the reasons previously cited in this report, the Committee finds no basis for placing any more reliance on the second estimate than in the first.

Mr. Speaker, there were other points in the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] with which I cannot agree. However, I do not believe it is necessary for me to make a point-by-point rebuttal. The report is impartial, objective, and based on sound, documented facts, and can speak for itself.

The report finds that the study which FDA has made is inadequate and recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare require FDA to do the study over.

Some of the specific inadequacies of the study cited in the report are:

First, FDA did not comply with the HEW regulations on site selection which require, among other things, the establishment of a site selection board and the preparation of a report reflecting the potential sites considered, the points considered in their comparative evaluation, and the reasons for the choice made.

Second, a list of 47 institutions supposedly meeting FDA's basic criteria for eligibility was incomplete and was reduced to six institutions on the basis of the personal opinions of one individual who did not visit any of the 47, and made no record of the basis for his actions.

Third, the final selection was made without any site visits by individuals

scientifically qualified to evaluate the potential contributions the institutions might make to FDA's research program.

Fourth, the study was made in such a hasty manner that adequate evaluation of all potential sites was impossible.

Fifth, there was an almost total absence of documentary support for the selection made.

Sixth, FDA officials were totally unaware of and did not apply the Bureau of the Budget and HEW criteria for determining whether a given facility is or is not susceptible to decentralization from the Washington area.

So far as I am concerned, the enactment of the 50-mile limitation in the appropriations act, simply means that the new study must begin at least 50 miles outside of Washington.

The letter from Mr. Cardwell follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1967.

Mr. W. DONALD GRAY,
Senior Investigator, Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee on the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: This will confirm our telephone conversation of this date.

The Food and Drug Administration advises:

1. They have made no new analysis or study of cost differentials between Beltsville and Madison, Wisconsin, or between Beltsville and other sites. The last analysis they made was contained in the report to the Committee on Appropriations, which was made a part of the subcommittee's hearing record.

2. They have no record of the University of Wisconsin having applied for consideration as an alternate site for Laboratory Building No. 2. They state that at no time did they invite the University of Wisconsin, or any other institution, to apply for consideration. However, following FDA's visit to the University of Wisconsin on March 2 and 3, 1967, representatives from the University did visit FDA; they received two visits. Mr. C. A. Engman, Vice President for Administration, visited FDA on March 16, 1967, and Dr. Robert M. Bock, Dean of the University's Graduate School, visited FDA on March 17, 1967.

3. They have not received any form of written statement from the University of Wisconsin indicating that land and/or utilities would be available at no cost to the Government.

With respect to your question of whether the Department has prepared a cost analysis which shows that the facility in question could be constructed at less cost at Madison or some other location away from the Washington, D.C., area, the answer is no.

I have verified my earlier statement to you to the effect that neither Mr. Kelly nor anyone else in the Office of the Secretary has issued information indicating that the facility could be constructed at Madison with a savings of as much as \$400,000.

As I told you, we did ask the Food and Drug Administration to obtain information about variations in the general construction cost index between Beltsville and Madison. We asked the Food and Drug Administration to do this several days ago in response to a specific request received from the Senate Committee, based on information relayed to us by FDA and obtained from GSA, that the Boeckh Construction Appraisal Manual currently shows general construction costs at Madison as being about 1 percent lower than those for the Washington, D.C., area. In relaying these data to the Committee on Ap-

propositions, we advised them, as we would advise you, that the index in question relates only to general non-Federal office and commercial construction and not to specialized laboratories of the type at issue. At this time, we are not able to furnish you with an accurate estimate of what all of the cost differentials might be. Clearly, the Boeckh index is not in itself sufficient for this purpose. However, if you like, we will be glad to ask the General Services Administration to prepare a special estimate for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. CARDWELL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Budget.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.
The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.
The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 21, line 14, insert the following: "Provided, That the sum made available in the 'Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1967' for transfer to the 'Office of Secretary, salaries and expenses' for a comprehensive study of training programs financed in whole or in part with Federal funds shall remain available until June 30, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: On page 31, line 11, insert the following: "Provided further, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from 'Community mental health resource support' an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustment made by the Secretary pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offered a motion, and I might say to the Members of the House that these are all only technical amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: On page 36, line 18, insert the following: "to remain available until December 31, 1968."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55: On page 37, line 17, insert the following: "of which \$50,000,000 for construction shall remain available until June 30, 1969".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said Amendment, insert "45,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: On page 37, line 18, insert the following: "Provided, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from 'Community health services' an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustments made by the Secretary pursuant to section 132(c) of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 61: On page 40, line 18, insert the following:

"HEALTH EDUCATION LOANS

"The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available in the following revolving funds, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation as provided by section 104 of the Government Cooperation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the 'Health Professions Education Fund' and the 'Nurse Training Fund'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "Cooperation" and insert in lieu thereof "Corporation".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: On page 46, line 11, insert the following:

"Grants to States, payments after April 30: For making, after April 30 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the last two months of the current fiscal year and for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the subsequent appropriation therefor for the current or succeeding fiscal year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: On page 51, line 5, strike out "\$6,739,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,139,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said Amendment, insert the following: "\$7,139,000, to include also provision for a comprehensive study of all currently authorized programs of the Federal Government that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding, and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE DANIEL J. FLOOD

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want my distinguished friend, the able gentleman from Pennsylvania, to take his seat without thanking him for his most generous reference to me of a moment ago. The gentleman's own famed eloquence is well known by his colleagues, and is exceeded only by his magnanimity to his friends.

CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and com-

pact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 795)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the eighteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress and the Ninety-second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large). No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1013; 71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein. Nor shall any State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census be required to elect its Representatives at Large."

And agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
HERBERT TENZER,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr.,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate passed the House bill after amending it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provisions.

The Senate insisted upon its amendment and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference.

Resolution of the disagreement between the Senate and the House has been difficult, and has required seven meetings between June 22, 1967, and October 18, 1967. On June 27, 1967, the conferees submitted a report, House Report No. 435. By unanimous consent of the House, that report on June 28, 1967, was recommended to the committee of conference (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 17739).

The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment to the bill and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being to insert, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, the matter agreed to by the conferees.

The conference report provides standards for use during the 91st Congress and the 92d Congress. The conferees were unable to resolve their disagreement as to the provisions for permanent standards for the establishment of congressional districts.

The conference report does not contain provisions that apply to the establishment of congressional districts for the 93d and subsequent Congresses.

Temporary standards for use during the 91st Congress and the 92d Congress were contained in section 2 of the bill as it passed the House. The conference report retains the first sentence of section 2 as it passed the House. This provision requires that, in each State entitled in the 91st Congress and in the 92d Congress to more than one Representative, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of authorized Representatives. Representatives shall be elected only from such districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative, except the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large.

The second sentence of the conference report provides that no State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal decennial census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the act of August 26, 1954, as amended, are available for use.

The conferees included this sentence in order to avoid the errors that necessarily must result from use of outdated social statistics obtained in the 18th decennial census conducted in 1960. Changes that have occurred in the structure of the U.S. population since 1960 are too vast in many instances to permit any reasonable degree of accuracy in establishing district lines on the basis of 1960 census data.

The expense and effort involved in congressional redistricting should not be devoted to an enterprise that necessarily in many States must be so inaccurate as to be unreasonable when based on 1960 census data. It is preferable to wait until the 19th decennial data is available if updated special census data is not available.

It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress if it so elects. The State, however, shall not be required to redistrict unless current census data is available.

The third sentence of the conference report provides that no State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census shall be required to elect its Representatives at-large. This provision underscores the intent of the conferees that Representatives shall be elected from districts and that until the results of the 19th Federal decennial census are available no State shall be required to elect its Representatives at Large.

EMANUEL CELLER,
HERBERT TENZER,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to be a conferee on a bill, particularly a major item of legislation such as H.R. 2508, the congressional districting bill, is a great honor and privilege. Unfortunately, I find that I must dissent from the report of my fellow House conferees and instead report to the House my dissenting views.

FAILURE TO FULFILL CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO SET STANDARDS FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

Both the House and Senate versions of this bill were attempts to fulfill Congress responsibility to set standards for the drawing of congressional district boundaries. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution instructs Congress to be the ultimate overseer of the "times, places and manner" of holding elections for U.S. Representative. In Chairman CELLER's words during House debate on April 27 the House was setting guidelines which the courts "must take most seriously into consideration."

For example, the House bill established a maximum permissible variation in the population of congressional districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections of 30 percent. The Senate instead provided for a maximum of 10 percent. The conference bill, however, does not attempt to fashion a compromise between those two standards. In fact, it does not provide any standards for the courts to follow in implementing the one-man, one-vote decision for the next two elections but instead it in effect tells the courts to not implement that decision and not to enforce those constitutional rights for those two elections. The conference report does not provide guidelines for the courts to "most seriously" take into consideration, but instead provides that—

No State shall be required to redistrict until census data is available from the 1970 census or a special Federal census (which must be requested by the States and in most cases would take 12 months to compile).

Let no one state that Congress is establishing a policy that it would be inadvisable and inequitable to use 1960 census data in the drawing of congressional districts. One could at least argue that would be an attempt to fulfill Congress' responsibility to set standards. However, one must point out that both the House and Senate versions of the bill provided that 1960 data would be appropriate in drawing congressional districts, even this late in the decennial period. But the conference bill does not really say that since it allows State legislatures to use 1960 data.

The statement of the majority of the House managers states:

It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress if it so elects.

The managers' statement attempts to have us believe that the changes in the Nation's populations since 1960 have been too great for the courts to use them in drawing congressional district boundaries, but that they are quite appropriate for use by State legislatures.

If 1960 data is not appropriate for drawing congressional districts, and would in the managers' words result in districts "so inaccurate as to be unreasonable," then Congress should not allow legislatures to use them. Since the conference report finds that 1960 data is good enough for legislatures then they are surely good enough for the courts, which have at least as good a reputation for being fair, reasonable, and impartial arbiters of political matters as do State legislatures.

The fact that the conference report takes the unreasonable and contradictory position of allowing State legislatures to use 1960 data but not allowing the courts to review that use, demonstrates that the true purpose of this bill is to prevent the courts from enforcing the constitutional right to have one man's vote count as much as any other's. In effect this bill would suspend the one-man, one-vote decision until the 1972 congressional elections.

In three States, California—with a 95-percent population disparity—New Jersey, and Indiana, the Federal courts have already determined that the current congressional districts violate the Constitution. Those determinations, and any possible future determinations, were and would be based on what the Constitution requires. Congress cannot by legislative act change the requirements of the Constitution.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

There are many other troubling aspects of this bill that I can only touch briefly. What would be the effect of the bill in those five States where court suits regarding congressional districts are pending, most of them before the Supreme Court in this term—Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida? Presumably this bill is designed to tell the Supreme Court it cannot require remedies for any constitutional inequities it may finally determine exist in those States.

Also there is no doubt that many other individual citizens will attempt to enforce their constitutional rights to equal representation on the House of Representatives by bringing Federal court suits. Is Congress attempting to say in this bill that the Federal judiciary, which since 1964 has been providing relief for such violations of the Constitution, must now suspend for the next 5 years the enforcement of the U.S. Constitution?

Many States such as Mississippi, Alabama, and my own State of Michigan, have redistricted in the last few years only as a result of Federal court orders, and now have plans which vary no more than 10 percent in the population of their districts.

What would stop the legislatures in those States from drawing new congressional districting plans which could vary by as much as 30, 100 or even the 257 percent which Michigan used to have. A suit

in Federal court could not afford relief for such a development since the court could not, under the terms of this bill, require any new redistricting until after the 1970 census data was available. Special Federal censuses must be requested by State legislatures which presumably would not do so in these cases.

THE ENTIRE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND MIGHT POSSIBLY RESULT IN AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

A bill which is illogical, violative of constitutional rights, and designed to suspend the power of the Federal courts to enforce a constitutional right would seem to be doomed to itself being declared unconstitutional. Unfortunately this bill contains no separability clause—as did the first conference report which was recommitted to conference on June 27—so the chances are that this entire bill would be declared unconstitutional.

This would be most unfortunate since that would also wipe out the first sentence of this three-sentence bill which prohibits at-large elections in 1968 and 1970—except in New Mexico and Hawaii. No member of the conference committee favored at-large elections for Members of the House of Representatives but that could certainly result from this bill.

Further delay and litigation would undoubtedly result from passage of this measure. The Supreme Court could easily not finally pass on this question until the spring of 1968. That is so late in the electoral process that in many States where the courts would find unconstitutional districtings, the Federal courts in those States might feel constrained to require all members in a State delegation to run at large.

CONCLUSION

It is my view that representatives of the two Houses of Congress could meet even now and fashion a compromise between the House and Senate versions which would satisfy the constitutional requirements for congressional districts to be drawn in a fair and reasonable manner.

I also feel that such a compromise could be fashioned so as to effect this desired goal with the least amount of confusion, litigation, and instability of congressional districts. Prohibition of at-large elections included in such a bill would be effective since a bill drafted in that manner would be secure against court attack and districting plans drawn in accordance with such a bill would likewise be secure against being declared void.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this conference report rather than pass a bill which will be declared unconstitutional. Only if we vote down this conference report, and act now to pass a bill setting forth reasonable and constitutional standards, will the Congress have an opportunity to guide both legislatures and the courts in their drawing of congressional district boundaries.

Mr. CELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the statement of the managers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, your conferees have been diligent and anxious to bring forth a proper solution to a very vexatious problem.

The attempt to get an agreement was difficult—as difficult as trying to shave an egg—and that is rather difficult.

There was no lack of diligence and effort. We labored from June onward. We had eight conferences. Debate was vigorous and keen.

You will remember that a previous report and agreement was presented and by unanimous consent was withdrawn. This impasse was due to the unusual situation in Indiana. We were disappointed with the withdrawal but it did not make us too unhappy. But we overcame our disappointment and again addressed ourselves to our labors.

In the meantime, the pressures and importunities from many sources mounted.

I will take some time to tell you about our difficulties—you will forgive me if I do.

It became apparent that to satisfy all 50 States, a bill with 50 sections in it would be essential—each section benefiting each State.

We met frequently, and as frequently we found ourselves at loggerheads. There were as many points of view as a centipede has legs. We got nowhere. It was like walking up a descending escalator. The longer we debated, the deeper we plunged into the quicksands of frustration. It became apparent that further discussion would be as useless as an empty bucket in an empty well.

We agreed to disregard all areas of disagreement and bring forth the slight areas of agreement. You have before you these slight areas of agreement.

They are as follows:

First. There can be no Members elected at large for the 91st and 92d Congresses except in the States of New Mexico and Hawaii.

Second. No State shall be compelled to redistrict for 91st and 92d Congresses without the benefit of up-to-date current census figures.

We left for future Congresses all other items including guidelines as to the matter of fair degree of equality of population, contiguity of district and compactness of districts.

Now I am going to read you some questions and answers—questions which might be asked of me by my colleagues and I will give you the answers. I hope in this question and answer form that this sort of dialog may make clear to you the purposes and nuances of this conference report.

Question: What is the principal objective of the conference report?

Answer: First, to ban elections of Representatives at large except in the States of Hawaii and New Mexico.

Second, to provide guidance to the courts that it is the sense of the Congress that States shall not be required to redistrict unless current data is available.

Third, to provide guidelines to the courts that it is the sense of the Con-

gress that until the Nineteenth Federal Decennial Census is completed, no State shall be required to elect its Representatives at large.

Question: Are there any States other than Hawaii and New Mexico that have Representatives at large?

Answer: No.

Question: Does the conference report prohibit a State from redistricting prior to the 93d Congress?

Answer: No; a State may voluntarily redistrict if it so elects. If it does elect to redistrict, it may use population figures from sources other than a special Federal census.

Question: Does the word "require" in the last two sentences of the conference report have a special meaning?

Answer: Yes; the word "require" was used by the conferees to mean that a court should not order a State to be redistricted prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census or order delegates to run at large prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census.

Question: Who pays for a Federal special census, if one is to be undertaken?

Answer: The State requesting the census pays for it. The cost is approximately 25 cents per person and will take approximately a year to complete a special census in the larger States like California, New York, and Illinois. But in smaller States it would take a much shorter period of time.

Question: What is wrong with the 1960 figures for redistricting purposes—and this is very important, gentlemen—

Answer: They are out of date. They are all askew. Vast changes have occurred throughout the United States that render the 1960 data completely unreasonable in terms of accuracy for redistricting purposes. Using 1960 figures for present-day conditions would be like trying to level a steep hill with a shovel instead of a bulldozer.

In the famous case in Maryland, *Citizens Committee against Tawes*, decided by Chief Justice Sobeloff in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, that judge had this to say about the 1960 census, which clearly indicates beyond peradventure of a doubt that you should use the 1960 census if you want to have any reasonable assurance that you are going to satisfy the principle of one man, one vote. The 1960 census is outmoded, antiquated, and there have been so many shifts in population. The judge said this, and mark ye well:

Even if a district plan initially comports with the one-to-one formula, discrepancies may be expected to arise with changing conditions. Such discrepancies are unavoidable and must be tolerated for a time until the next census. But in initial districting, the aim should be to come as closely as possible to a one-to-one ratio.

A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966—

This case was decided in 1966—

to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures, which are not up to date, or attempt to make estimates of changes in popu-

lation figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded—

He is speaking for the court—

we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into a mathematical thicket.

He said in essence that the 1960 census is not good. He with his colleagues drew the lines reluctantly with the 1960 census figures, as bad as they were.

In other words, he concluded with the famous words of Shakespeare:

Rather bear the ills we have than fly to those we know not of.

That is what we are doing in this conference report. We say that you need a new census. The 1960 census is outmoded. It is unfair. Therefore, no State should be required to redistrict unless there are current figures, unless the figures are up to date. You can only get them up to date by a special census. We asked the Bureau of Census whether or not there were any other estimates that would fairly or accurately reflect the numbers of persons or the populations of various districts.

Answer: There are no population estimates that the census would rely upon for redistricting purposes.

Question: How is the conference report intended to affect court cases where districts are challenged?

Answer: The conference report provides guidance to the courts. It is anticipated that the courts would follow the conference report and require the results of a special census to be available before it would order a State to be redistricted. If, however, a court found that existing districts in fact were contrary to the Constitution, the court of its own order could draw new district lines. They have in a number of cases drawn new district lines. In event districts were found to be unconstitutional, the conference report intends that the court could draw new district lines and not order representatives to run at large.

Question: Have the courts actually drawn district lines rather than rely upon State legislatures to draw district lines?

Answer: Yes; the courts have drawn district lines in Arizona, Illinois, Maryland, and Montana.

Question: Does the conference report prohibit redistricting even though present districts are found by the court to be unconstitutional?

Answer: No. The conference report only provides that a court will not order a State legislature to establish new districts unless the results of a special Federal census are available. The court may draw new lines if it finds it necessary for compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. But remember, the court cannot compel redistricting save with the benefit of new and current figures.

Question: Is the conference report constitutional?

Answer: That is a rather sticky question. My answer is this. If the conference report is enacted into law, it will be presumed to be constitutional. In any event, it will be constitutional until the court rules otherwise. I personally—and my colleagues in the majority on the conference—deemed this report to be constitutional.

Question: In some States, such as Indiana, the existing districts have been declared to be unconstitutional and the court has ordered new districts to be established. What is the effect of the conference report in such cases?

Answer: The conference report, if enacted into law, would express the intent of Congress that no State shall be required to be redistricted prior to the Nineteenth Decennial Census unless the results of a special Federal census are available. It would be in order for the parties, I think, in such a case to move the court to reconsider its order in the light of the new law contained in the conference report, but in no event would Members from that State of Indiana be elected at large.

Question: Which States currently are under court order to redistrict?

Answer: At the present time the Legislatures of California, Indiana, and New Jersey are under court order to redistrict.

Question: In what States are cases pending challenging the validity of district lines?

Answer: Texas, Missouri, Ohio, New York, and Florida.

Question: Are there any States where the districts are subject to challenge under constitutional standards but in which no cases have as yet been instituted?

Answer: I understand there are eight such States: Georgia, where the largest district exceeds the smallest by 38.2 percent; Iowa, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 25.3 percent; Louisiana, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 25 percent; Minnesota, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 28.6 percent; Nebraska, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 31.1 percent; Pennsylvania, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 35.1 percent; Washington, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 26 percent; and West Virginia, where the largest exceeds the smallest by 39.2 percent.

That, in question and answer form, I hope gives considerable information to the Members of the House, and might illuminate in their minds exactly what we are driving at with reference to the conference report.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I have several questions to propound to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the meaning and the interpretation of some of the language in the conference report before us.

My questions stem in large measure from the circumstances in the State of Indiana, which are as follows:

A Federal court has ruled unconstitu-

tional the Indiana State statute of 1965 which established the congressional districts from which the present Members of the House of Representatives from Indiana were elected.

The Indiana General Assembly which met earlier this year adjourned without having reached agreement on a new statute providing for congressional districting in Indiana.

The Indiana General Assembly does not meet again in regular session until 1969, that is to say, after the congressional election of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, let us assume for purposes of my question that the Indiana General Assembly is unable in any Special Session which may be called prior to the 1968 congressional election to reach agreement on a congressional districting statute:

First. My first question therefore pertains to the following language in H.R. 2508, as reported by the committee of the conference:

In each State entitled in the Ninety-first Congress and the Ninety-second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled "An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives" (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative (except that the States of Hawaii and New Mexico may continue to elect their Representatives at Large.)

Does this language mean that in Indiana, if the general assembly does not, in a special session, establish congressional districts in time to hold the 1968 congressional nominations and elections, a court of appropriate jurisdiction would be able to establish the Congressional districts from which the 1968 congressional nominations and elections must be conducted?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my answer to that question is in the affirmative, that the Congress could not take away the jurisdiction of the court to decide such an issue. Further, if the State failed or refused, under the circumstances indicated, to redistrict, the court would have the power to draw those lines, and the court has done so in several instances.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, under the circumstances which, as I have indicated, exist in Indiana, would it not be reasonable to assume that the court would draw the lines?

Mr. CELLER. This conference report requires that district lines cannot be required to be drawn unless based upon current census figures. Lines should not be drawn based upon the 1960 census unless these are the only figures the court finds acceptable. Conceivably, the court would follow the admonition of the Congress and would seek to obtain data which is more current before it draws its lines.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to complete my questioning of the

distinguished chairman before the distinguished chairman yields to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me state the following question, as in the question I heretofore raised, but in more general terms as follows: In a State in which the congressional districts existing at the time of passage of this act are unconstitutionally apportioned, or in which the State legislature has not established congressional districts in time for the 1968 congressional nominations and elections, excepting the States of Hawaii and New Mexico, does this language allow a court of appropriate jurisdiction to establish congressional districts from which the 1968 congressional nominations and elections must be conducted?

Mr. CELLER. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, my next question follows: Does the language of H.R. 2508 prevent a court from ordering the conduct of elections at large in States other than Hawaii and New Mexico?

Mr. CELLER. There is a definite prohibition contained in the conference report against the election of Representatives at large. The courts would follow that admonition.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my other question deals with the second sentence of the conference report, which reads as follows:

No State shall be required to redistrict prior to the 19th Federal Decennial Census unless the results of a special Federal census conducted pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1013; 71 Stat. 481; 13 U.S.C. 8), are available for use therein.

In a State in which existing districts have been found unconstitutional, does this provision allow a court of appropriate jurisdiction to establish congressional districts on the basis of the 1960 census and order the 1968 congressional nominations and elections to be conducted from such districts?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. The conference report permits the court to establish congressional districts as are necessary to comply with the requirements of the Constitution. The districts could be based on such population figures as the court determines to be adequate, including 1960 census figures, if the court wanted to.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, my final question is this: Is the language of H.R. 2508 severable for purposes of judicial interpretation?

Mr. CELLER. The court would have the power to separate its rulings, since there are two distinct subjects involved in the conference report. One subject involves redistricting and the other subject involves banning the election of Representatives at Large. Therefore, since there are two distinct subjects involved, the court would have the power to separate them and to rule thereon.

Mr. BRADEMÁS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and commend the gentleman for his work in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this conference report is agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, you mentioned the Redistricting Act that was passed in the State of Maryland in 1966, and you spoke of our very eminent judge, Simon Soboloff, whom I hold in very high esteem.

I would like to know whether you are referring to the fact that he did in fact use in his decision the 1960 census?

Mr. CELLER. Judge Simon Soboloff said that he had to use the 1960 census figures, because he had no other choice, but further stated that he had rather not use them, because they were outmoded figures.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Therefore, the question of the redistricting of the State of Maryland in fact was based upon the 1960 census?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; and the court drew the lines itself.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee this: In the series of questions and answers which he propounded a moment ago he asked the question in the event there was no special census "could a court compel a State to redistrict its lines?" and the answer he gave to that question was "No." But my recollection was that the chairman also said that even in such a case the court itself might still redistrict the lines?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. STRATTON. Then let me ask the distinguished chairman this: The precise wording of the conference report is that "no State shall be required to redistrict in the event that this special census is not available." Would not a decision of the court saying to the people of that State that "you shall have your Congressman run from the following new districts," be itself a requirement that that State redistrict itself, which the conference report prohibits?

Mr. CELLER. I would say that it is a requirement. I would say that it is a sort of admonition, it is a very strong, powerful, potent force that the court would follow. But we cannot dictate to a court of competent jurisdiction what they shall do under circumstances where they have declared lines to be unconstitutionally drawn, we cannot interfere.

Mr. STRATTON. But is it still the gentleman's impression, as the gentleman responded to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMÁS], that even in such a case the court would in practice probably carry out the will of the Congress?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I am quite sure it would.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say when the Supreme Court got into what was termed the political thicket the facts developed

indicated that there were many reasons why the Congress perhaps should take action itself. At that time I introduced two resolutions, one for the Court's findings, calling it to the attention of the House of Representatives, and the other calling for an act of Congress. We all realize the Court has no money to pay itself, or to enforce its decrees except as the legislative branch may cooperate in. The point I wish to make is that by passing this legislation, and my State at the moment does not seem to be involved one way or another—we are not acknowledging that the Court has the right to determine or to step in to prevent the House or the Congress from exercising its right under the Constitution to be the sole judges of the qualifications of its Members—we are not yielding in that regard in your opinion?

Mr. CELLER. No, sir; none whatsoever. And may I interject, the gentleman remembers the famous statement of President Jackson when he said:

The Supreme Court has made its decision. Now let them try to enforce it—

Mr. WHITTEN. I do—

Mr. CELLER (continuing):

The Court has no battalions, no soldiers, they cannot enforce their decrees.

Mr. WHITTEN. And no money to pay themselves.

So I believe that I can agree with the gentleman that the Court can decide anything, and it is up to the Congress to decide whether we wish to follow it or not insofar as the qualifications for the Members in line with the Constitution.

Mr. CELLER. In addition, we have a specific authority under the Constitution which I will read, section 4, article 1:

The Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations—

With reference to the election of Congressmen—

except as to the places of choosing Senators.

I will read the whole section:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. WHITTEN. I just wanted to be sure that by passing an act here that we are in no way agreeing that the Court has any power to interfere with the exercise of our own right to determine the qualifications of the Members.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

This is a very sticky proposition, and I hope the Members will bear with me. It is rather difficult to answer all of these questions that are being fired at me, I am doing the best I can.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The question I am going to propose, of course, affects the State of New York, of which State the able gentleman [Mr. CELLER], of course, is a Representative in the Congress.

The question is this: If the court has ordered a redistricting because it has found that the present lines are unconstitutional under the one-man, one-vote rule, although it has ordered the redistricting and it has drawn the lines—

Mr. CELLER. That is the case in New York now.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is exactly right.

Mr. CELLER. The case is on appeal to the Supreme Court.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. That is correct.

In the event the Supreme Court of the United States does not reverse the statutory court, may the court then draw the lines disregarding the alleged or supposed admonition or recommendation of the Congress?

Mr. CELLER. The court can do it. But as I know the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and knowing the manner of men and type of judges who occupy the high judicial office in that court, I doubt very much whether they would disregard the solemn proclamation and admonition—and I use that word again—of this Congress.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. But it may disregard the admonition?

Mr. CELLER. It could—yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. In other words, it may disregard the admonition, because it is a question of your interpretation against theirs. It is a question of whether or not they feel that the lines which were erroneously drawn should be redrawn in keeping with the finding of the court under the one-man, one-vote rule.

Mr. CELLER. I am willing to pit my judgment against theirs any day.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Except that you cannot enforce your judgment, whereas they can.

Mr. CELLER. When it comes to that question, I would say I have more power than they have in the sense that I, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, am making certain recommendations which I hope the House of Representatives will adopt and follow.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The House may adopt the recommendations but there is no requirement that the recommendations must be followed—there is only an admonition.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. From reading the conference report and the response of the distinguished chairman of the committee to questions that have been propounded to him, it would leave this Member to believe that the following is the fact, and I would like to have the chairman confirm my understanding.

With the exception of the State of Hawaii and New Mexico, as I understand the ban against State at-large elections for Members, it also carries with it implicitly the banning of multi-Member elections.

Mr. CELLER. Yes, sir; that is correct. You cannot have more than one Congressman from one district.

Mr. BURTON of California. That is my understanding and I am glad that the chairman's view with respect to this squares with my own understanding.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE], a member of the committee.

Mr. HUNGATE. I should like to speak briefly in opposition to this, if I might have 5 minutes of time.

Mr. CELLER. I will yield time to the gentleman later.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the State of New Jersey the court has ordered that we redistrict and there was a redistricting by the State legislature. The redistricting was contested and the court upon challenge found that those districts were invalid.

However, because of the time question, the courts permitted us to run in districts which were invalid, but only for the 1966 elections. They mandated that we not be able to run in those invalid districts in 1968.

My question is, Would this legislation, first of all, prohibit the courts from ordering that we redistrict in order to apportion validly?

Mr. CELLER. No; it would not.

Mr. RODINO. It would not?

Mr. CELLER. No. The State itself could also redistrict under those circumstances.

Mr. RODINO. In view of the fact that there is one exception here, and that is that the States of Hawaii and Alaska may be permitted to run at large, but that no other States may run at large, then if the courts ordered that we be redistricted, could the courts order that we run at large?

Mr. CELLER. No; the court cannot. There is an absolute prohibition against a State being compelled to permit at-large elections.

Mr. RODINO. In other words, as I understand the chairman's interpretation of this legislation, this would not prevent the legislature from redistricting and the court from ordering it, but the court could not order us to run at large?

Mr. CELLER. Correct.

Mr. RODINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that same point for one question?

Mr. CELLER. I have only 1 hour, and many Members have asked for time. Will the gentleman permit me to allow some of the other Members to have time before I answer any more questions?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR].

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 of this year the House passed H.R. 2508, providing Federal standards for congressional redistricting. There were two important sections to that bill. The first section provided for standards in the post-1970 census period. The second section provided for interim standards applicable to the next two Congresses.

Let me address myself first to the section 1 provisions covering the post-1970 census period.

The House-passed bill was approved by the conferees without change, and was recommended to this House for

adoption without change on June 27. The provisions for the post-1970 census period, which you are now asked to abandon, were as follows:

First. When a State is entitled to more than one Representative, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of authorized Representatives.

Second. Representatives shall be elected only from such districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative. Existing provisions for a Representative at large are eliminated.

Third. Each district shall be composed of contiguous territory, in as reasonably a compact form as the State finds practicable.

Fourth. The district with the largest population shall not exceed by more than 10 percent the district with the smallest population in number of persons.

Fifth. Population shall be based on the then most recent decennial census, but if a State redistricts more than 2 years after a decennial census, the population figures to be used must be those of a statewide Federal special census.

Sixth. Unless the particular State constitution requires otherwise, there shall not be more than one districting between decennial censuses.

The conference report from which I have just quoted, report No. 435, adopted verbatim the provisions as passed by the House of Representatives for the post-1970 census period.

You will remember, ladies and gentlemen, that on June 28 the distinguished chairman of our committee appeared in the well and asked unanimous consent to return to conference the June 27 agreement, and for one reason only: The conferees had not made adequate protection against at-large races in the interim period before the 1970 census figures became available.

We went back to conference and I thought we would talk about that temporary problem. To my amazement last week I found the conferees were about to recommend a new conference report—one which abandoned the post-1970 census provisions that the House passed in April, and which the conferees agreed to in June—without explanation.

If recognized, I will move to recommit the report to the conference with instructions to reinstate the permanent provisions that I have outlined.

Also, so as to make sure that under the rules of the House I am recognized to offer the motion to recommit, my recommittal motion will also deal with the question of how we might do what Mr. CELLER wanted to do when he appeared in the well of the House on June 28 and asked for the report to be recommitted to conference. My motion will provide for the interim period:

There shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative.

The essential recommittal provisions therefore will be these:

First. Single-Member districts from now until we have a 1970 census.

Second. After we have the 1970 census, the provisions which the House passed in April, and to which the conferees agreed on June 27, will be applicable.

I have circularized a letter to each Member of this body indicating my intention to move to reinstate the permanent provisions which the conferees would now have us abandon.

Since, then, for parliamentary purposes, I have made one modest modification in my motion, and that is to conform to the move now afoot in the other body to outlaw at-large contests between now and the time we have the results of the 1970 census figures.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman's motion to recommit, the gentleman will reaffirm the action which was taken unanimously in the House and what was in the conference report at that time, so if we vote for the gentleman's motion to recommit, we will be in effect approving the action we took, with corrective measures?

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We will be saying we want to stick to the House provisions on the permanent standards for the makeup of congressional districts.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Minnesota for his position. As the principal plaintiff in the key redistricting lawsuit in Federal court in Texas, I plead for districts which were not only reasonably close in population but which would be reasonably compact and certainly contiguous. It is essential that we have some language which will protect the people against gerrymandering. I hope the gentleman's position will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I rise to oppose the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2508.

I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is correct in his belief that a motion to recommit is essential.

The conference's failure to adopt standards for congressional districts after the 1970 census is a step backward.

In the other body the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], has termed this bill a "nondistricting proposal" and with that I agree.

The report of the conference committee is unacceptable and should be defeated.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a travesty.

First, it abandons all pretense in its effort to nullify the basic principle reflected in the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision.

Second, it abandons any sincere effort to meet the constitutional mandate that the Congress set its standards, an effort endorsed by this body when H.R. 2508 passed this house several months ago.

Third, it perpetrates for at least four intolerable years the inequities of the past, without even token expression of interest in the basic immorality involved.

Fourth, in essence this bill represents nothing more nor less than a total and complete abdication of the House's responsibility to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I resent this bill and all it implies.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state that the motion to recommit, if carried, will put us exactly where we were 5 months ago. It provides for guidelines. I was one of the foremost of all the conferees who fought for guidelines, and I could not get them. I could not get the Senate conferees to agree to these guidelines.

If we try to recommit and insist upon guidelines, we will get nowhere. We will be just exactly where we were when we started these conferences last June. It would be an exercise of utter inutilty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I think we have to admit there is the depressing atmosphere of a funeral service about this debate today. But I think every corpse should be decently interred. On these occasions some human understanding and empathy is in order. I think we can take comfort in our hope for the future, and I do not think there is any point at all in flailing around in anguish and frustration. That is nearly the situation that we must face candidly today.

I might report to the House that the death in this case was caused from wounds received from others and not from the Members of the House.

It is no secret that the House conferees had agreed to accept the House interim provisions and the Senate permanent provisions for congressional districts. This would have been an honest compromise. I included these provisions in H.R. 13691, which I have introduced and for which I solicit support.

But this is all prolog. What are the merits of the case before us?

There are benefits to be salvaged from this report—though they are meager, and I am the first to say so, but they are better than nothing.

One man, one vote is certainly an important principle in the conduct of representative government. I yield to the

prior claim of the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as the first leader in the fight for fair congressional districts. He has been leading that fight for a long time, but I claim to have been in the fight with him as vigorously and as actively as any other Member of this House. One man, one vote should, of course, be one of the guiding principles in representative government.

It is not, however, the only principle. It is not the only thing that we have to consider when we are talking about representative government. There are other things of importance if we are to have successful representative government.

The stability of political institutions has something to do with this. The familiarity of the voters and the people with the voting districts and the familiarities of the voters and the people with the candidates who are running have something to do with it. All these things are important also. They have to be considered.

I would say, moreover, that one-man, one-vote depends on the availability of reliable statistics. A witness to this need is the judicial opinion already referred to by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Judge Sobelof's opinion in *Maryland Citizens Committee v. Tawes* (253 F. Supp. 731 (1966)), in which he said that to deviate from regular census figures was to enter a mathematical thicket.

I quote from page 734 of his opinion:

A difficulty encountered by anyone who undertakes in 1966 to draw district lines with a view to achieving substantial population equality, is that the only accurate figures available are those from the 1960 census. The dilemma presents two possible choices: to accept the 1960 census figures which are not up to date, or to attempt to make estimates of changes in population figures since that date. Neither choice is a happy one, but we have concluded that it is better to adhere to the census figures than to engage in speculative estimates or projections which vary widely with the estimators and the manner in which they handle the figures available to them from various sources. The alternative we have rejected would indeed lead into a mathematical thicket.

Mr. Speaker, the 1960 census figures are archaic and outgrown. There are no reliable statistics presently available.

If we reject this conference report, we invite the courts to rummage through the file cabinets of the Nation for attractive figures that might help to direct their progress through the political thickets of congressional redistricting.

Since we have knowledge of the situation in Indiana, where an at-large congressional election is now imminent, I believe we would acquiesce by silence to such an at-large race there or elsewhere if we reject this report. What could be more contrary to the principle of one man, one vote than to condone at-large races in great and populous States like Indiana?

Our choices are limited.

First, we can recommit this bill. In my opinion that will return it to a committee which probably will never meet to reconsider it.

Second, we can adopt the report. Then one of two things will happen.

It will go to the other body, where a new look can be given it, and new instructions may be given to the conferees there, and we may finally observe a case of reviving the corpse.

At the very least, we will prevent new kinds of inequities and new kinds of injustice which might result from new panaceas that would be applied in the absence of reliable statistics and under the pressure of continued congressional silence.

The prudent course and the right course, I believe, is to adopt this report. That is the responsible course, in my judgment, in the interest of representative government. That is why I am urging a vote against the motion to recommit and a vote for the adoption of the report.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Will the gentleman please talk for a half minute to the subject of compactness and contiguity insofar as the conference report is written?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Obviously there are not any provisions on compactness and contiguity here.

If the gentleman is interested in those subjects, the thing to do is to send the report back to the other body as written, to let the other body give instructions to its conferees, because that is where the trouble is on those questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be advised when I have 10 seconds remaining, so that the only other member of the committee against this bill in the first place, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], may have some time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the committee for yielding and permitting me to say something about this conference report.

Six months ago on April 27 when the House first considered the question of congressional districting, it was with the intent of establishing standards which would both uphold the constitutional right for one man's vote to count as much as any other's and also to set clear and reasonable standards for enforcing this recently established interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. In fact that goal was to fulfill the high constitutional responsibility of the Congress under article I, section 4, of the U.S. Constitution to be the ultimate overseer of "the times, places, and manner of holding elections" for U.S. Representative.

On that day we had heated debate over the propriety, constitutionality, and wisdom of the standards set forth by the original version of the bill. Members disputed as to whether some of the provisions actually fulfilled the constitutional principle of one-man, one-vote. But at least all would admit that the original

version did establish some standards. Then the Senate rejected the House's version and substituted a bill which was designed to eliminate all doubts as to the constitutionality of the House's version and to fully guarantee the fair drawing of the sizes and shapes of congressional districts.

But this conference report is not a compromise and adjustment between these two different versions. The conference committee has actually thrown out both the House and Senate versions and has written a totally new bill. Let me give you just one of many examples.

The House bill established a maximum permissible variation in the population of congressional districts for the 1968 and 1970 elections of 30 percent. The Senate provided a maximum of 10 percent. The conference bill does not, as one would expect, provide a compromise between those two figures. Amazingly enough it is actually drafted to prevent any redistricting at all for the 1968 and 1970 elections, even in States which have far above the House's standards of 30 percent.

The conference report's justification for this language is that 1960 census data is quite out of date and that States should wait until 1970 census data is available. The only exception for waiting for the 1970 data is the use of special statewide censuses. But such data is only available if the State requests it and pays millions of dollars for it.

Most State legislatures will not meet again until 1969 and in most States it would take more than a year for the data to be available from the time the State requested it. The result would be that probably even for the 1970 election new data would not be available. The net result of these census data provisions is to prevent the Federal courts from requiring any new redistricting before the 1972 elections.

Now a court might take the unprecedented steps of ordering a State Governor to call a special session of the legislature, and also order the legislature to both request a special census and appropriate the millions of dollars necessary to pay for it. But in almost every State even such a procedure would not result in the new data being available in time to use in drawing districts for 1968 since the data would take at least 12 months to compile.

THE ENTIRE CONFERENCE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The truth of the matter is that this bill is not a statement of policy under the Congress article I, section 4 responsibility to establish the manner for electing Representatives. Instead, this bill attempts to prohibit the courts from enforcing constitutional rights of American citizens for the next two congressional elections. Mr. Speaker, my main reason for opposing this conference report is that this proposal is a default by Congress on its constitutional responsibilities and a vain and irresponsible attempt to interfere with the Federal judiciary's fulfillment of their separate constitutional responsibilities.

Three and a half years ago the Supreme Court construed the requirement

of article I, section 2 of the Constitution that Representatives shall be chosen "by the people of the several States" to mean that "as nearly as practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Wesberry v. Sanders* 376 U.S. 1, 8 (1964). There are only two ways that this constitutional mandate can be given effect in a State whose current congressional districts vary in population beyond reasonable limits and so have been found to be unconstitutional.

Congressional districts may be established as nearly equal in population as practical from each of which one Representative is to be elected. Or all the State's representatives can be elected at large.

This bill is designed to take from the courts both of these weapons for enforcing the Constitution. The bill prohibits the courts from requiring that new districts be established since, as I explained previously, even a special census would not provide new data in time for the next congressional elections. Also the bill prohibits the courts from using its other weapons since it would prohibit at-large elections.

This bill is really an attempt to undermine the *Wesberry* decision where the Supreme Court first decided that the drawing of congressional districts was a proper subject for judicial consideration. We are actually dealing with a cleverly designed attempt to state that while the courts may consider the issue justiciable, Congress is prohibiting the Court for the next two elections from using the only available means for enforcing decisions under that doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply an attempt by Congress to prohibit the courts from enforcing the U.S. Constitution which, under our system of separation of powers among the three branches of the Government, it can never do.

Let no one attempt to defend this bill by stating that Congress is not interfering with the Court's enforcement of the Constitution, but merely establishing guidelines for all to use in drawing congressional district boundaries. For this conference bill does not establish a general policy that it would be inadvisable and inequitable to use 7-year-old data in the drawing of congressional districts. That statement of the majority of the House managers argues that 1960 data is not appropriate for courts to require to be used in drawing congressional districts since they would result in districts "so inaccurate as to be unreasonable." But then they specifically state that State legislatures may voluntarily use such data in the following words:

It is to be emphasized that nothing in the conference report prohibits a State from redistricting prior to the 93rd Congress if it so elects.

I submit that such a double standard is no standard at all. This double standard further illustrates that the purpose of this bill is to prevent the courts from taking action for the next two elections regarding the proper drawing of congressional districts. The purpose of this conference bill is to suspend the one-man, one-vote constitutional right of

every American until the 1972 congressional elections.

THE CONFERENCE BILL INCREASES THE POSSIBILITY OF AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

The conference bill does include a provision which I think almost every Member of this House supports—that at-large elections should be prohibited. Unfortunately the prohibition against at-large elections is inseparably related to the central purpose of this bill which is to prevent court enforcement of the one-man, one-vote decision.

For example the bill's first sentence prohibits at-large elections and then, repeats the prohibition by stating:

Nor shall any State prior to the 19th Federal decennial census be required to elect its Representatives at large.

There is certainly something peculiar about requiring new decennial census data before a State may be required to elect its Representatives at Large. Why do you need census data, if there are to be no districts? You only need a prohibition against requiring members to run at large between now and 1972 if you want to guarantee that the courts have no remedy to assure a one-man, one-vote situation. Since the prohibition of at-large elections is designed not as a statement of public policy, but as a second means of prohibiting the court from enforcing the Constitution, I fear that the courts will just declare the entire bill unconstitutional. This possibility is heightened by the fact that the bill does not contain the usual separability clause, which even the first conference report of last June contained.

A second reason I fear that this bill will result in at-large elections is that the only definite result of passage of this bill is additional litigation in the courts on this question. By the time the Supreme Court acts on the basic question and then the district courts implement that decision in each separate jurisdiction we will probably be far into the spring of 1968. That is so late in the political schedule for nominations to Congress in many States that there would not be adequate time for even court-drawn districts to be built into the State's election procedures. Also many district courts have stated their strong inclination against drawing political boundaries. And the spring of 1968 would certainly be far too late to allow for the time-consuming process of State legislatures drawing congressional districts.

A likely result of these considerations would be for the courts to select the other and easier method of enforcing the one-man, one-vote doctrine by requiring at-large elections.

ONE SURE WAY OF PROHIBITING AT-LARGE ELECTIONS

Mr. Speaker, there is one sure and constitutional way of prohibiting at-large elections.

I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body the announced plan of a Member of the Senate, who is going to offer an amendment to a pending House-passed bill on the Senate calendar, that would prohibit at-large elections.

On October 24, Senator BAKER, as is in-

dictated on page 29815 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, indicated that he is going to offer an amendment that would insure that no Members would have to run at large.

That amendment, which would come over as a rider, would allow everyone who is deeply disturbed about the possibility of Members having to run at large an opportunity to pass a bill to prohibit just that. Such a bill would be constitutional since it would not be an attempt to prohibit court enforcement of the one-man, one-vote rule. Such a procedure would still allow the courts full powers to enforce the Constitution by requiring the drawing of new congressional district boundaries.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to vote against this conference report since it is unconstitutional and demeans the dignity of this House. As I mentioned we can assure the prohibition of at-large elections without getting us into the disturbing problems raised by this bill. And we can still go forward and pass a districting bill which will be constitutional and a honorable fulfillment of our responsibilities.

It is my view that representatives of the two Houses of Congress could meet even now and fashion a compromise between the House and Senate versions which would satisfy the constitutional requirements for congressional districts to be drawn in a fair and reasonable manner.

I also feel that such a compromise could be fashioned so as to effect this desired goal with the least amount of confusion, litigation, and instability of congressional districts. Districting plans drawn in accordance with such a bill would likewise be secure against being declared void.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this conference report rather than pass a bill which will be declared unconstitutional. Only if we vote down this conference report, and act now to pass a bill setting forth reasonable and constitutional standards, will the Congress have an opportunity to guide both legislatures and the courts in their drawing of congressional district boundaries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be voted down.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to the Members of the House that we cannot adequately handle this legislation in the time allotted. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am shocked at the conference report and shall oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, this House unanimously approved the last conference report which contained permanent standards. After the vote and after the conference report was published, it then appeared that because of a technicality, the bill would permit general elections at large. For this reason and this reason only the report was recommitted to conference with the understanding that the only subject to be dealt with was the election of at-large Representatives. Now we find

that this conference report has been completely and totally changed so that it now would eliminate all permanent standards references and would prohibit Federal courts from requiring States to reapportion until the next decennial census.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this legislation is patently unconstitutional.

This legislation dramatically illustrates, Mr. Speaker, the need to implement rule X of the House rules within the spirit and purpose of the rule. Under this rule, the Speaker shall appoint all conference committees and I concede that his discretion is absolute. We cannot tell him whom to appoint and it is, of course, common practice for the Speaker to appoint the managers from the committees that reported the bill. But members of the committees, the House managers, are supposed to be chosen to represent the attitude of the House—V. Hines 6369. As a matter of fact, the precedents of the House clearly indicate that the Speaker has passed over the ranking member of a committee in order to achieve a proper representation of House views—VIII. Cannon 3223.

In my judgment, therefore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should appoint managers who will represent the attitude of the House. How can a Member who opposes legislation and votes against it be expected after passage to support it in conference? Certainly, the majority, at least, of the managers should be selected from the membership that voted in favor of the measure passed by the House. In the instant case, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the House has been completely ignored. The conference report is political expediency at its worst. If no agreement could be reached, the conferees should have reported back to that effect. To try and pass the conference report as a proper and worthwhile compromise is most regrettable. I hope the membership will oppose this conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I rise in support of the conference report and urge that it be adopted. I concur in the statement of the distinguished chairman [Mr. CELLER] that the 1960 Federal census is out of date. Congress has been wrestling with the problem of congressional redistricting almost since the beginning of our country, but up until 1964 this problem was left to Congress and the courts have meticulously kept hands off.

In 1964 in the case of Wesberry against Sanders, the Supreme Court of the United States adopted the so called one-man, one-vote doctrine and advised the States to comply with their decision or face court redistricting.

In 1964 the 1960 Federal census was already almost 4 years old. The Supreme Court did not say that the 1960 Federal

census must be adhered to but only that districts must be composed as nearly as practicable of equal numbers of people.

Many States, including Ohio, went about conscientiously attempting to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the State Legislature in Ohio formed an Interim Study Commission immediately after the release of the Federal census in 1960 and before the Supreme Court decision in Wesberry against Sanders to study the problem of congressional redistricting in Ohio. I was a member of that commission.

We presented several plans to the State legislature which, for various reasons were rejected. In 1963 a committee of the State legislature was formed to try again without success. In 1964 came the Wesberry against Sanders decision. I think no one in the State legislature or on the committees to study congressional redistricting disagreed with the Supreme Court decision. The problem was to properly implement it and carry it out. In 1965, a committee was again formed to prepare a bill for congressional redistricting to present to the State legislature. The Supreme Court said that each district should contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. When we examined the 1960 population figures, we found that already by 1965 the census figures were outdated, outmoded, and could not be used to determine the number of inhabitants living in some of the districts. For instance, the 12th Congressional District, with the Honorable SAMUEL L. DEVINE as Representative, had a population of 682,962 based on the Federal census of 1960. When we started to reduce the number of inhabitants living in his district to the 404,000 figure, which was the optimum figure for the number of people living in Ohio districts, we found we would not do it based on the 1960 census. We could see, for instance, that one tract which was listed as having some 200 inhabitants now, in 1965, had over 5,000 inhabitants. We could see that the area in which I live was no longer farmland but was a community of 1,000 people. You did not have to take a census, you did not have to guess—you could see them. Houses had been built and people were living there. Well, obviously, to put one census tract down as having 200 people and the other as 0 would not be accurate and we felt would not comply with the mandate of the Supreme Court that districts were to be composed of people and not cows and chickens. So, we went about trying to determine on our own the actual population of the districts based on the latest available figures.

For example, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce maintains population estimates composed of factors such as the number of building permits, the number of new postal addresses, the number of births, the number of deaths, water and sewer permits, and so forth. Based on these factors, the Columbus Area Chamber of Commerce is able to project population estimates within one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal census, and did in 1960.

Using these factors, our committee found that the population of Franklin

County was not 682,962 according to the 1960 Federal census but was over 786,000, an increase of 100,000 persons in less than 5 years. So we decided to divide Franklin County into two districts—which would mean that the 12th District would now have almost 400,000 and the 15th District, or the other half of Franklin County would have almost 400,000—within any recognizable guideline of the Supreme Court decisions as to population variation.

If we had used the 1960 Federal census figures, the 12th District was about 18 percent too small. If we used actual head count figures, the population was just about right. We redistricted on the basis present population where it could be proved as in Franklin County. The redistricting proposal in the State of Ohio was taken to the Federal District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, and was upheld based on the showing that there was sufficient evidence that the redistricting complied with the one-man one-vote doctrine as nearly as practicable.

I point this out to show one State's conscientious efforts were made before the Supreme Court decision and again after to redistrict on a fair basis. The same may be said for other States. It seems to me that it is desirable to allow the matter to settle until we have up-to-date Federal census figures. It seems to me that there is something to be said for continuity in this area since it has only been 3 years since the now famous Wesberry against Sanders decision and the problem has not been solved to everyone's satisfaction for over 100 years before that.

In 1970, the Federal census will be watched with one eye to the Wesberry against Sanders decision and another eye on congressional redistricting. I support the conference report as a solution until the 1970 Federal census which can be the basis for the formation of meaningful, exact, and succinct population guidelines.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] for the timely example which so clearly indicates the need for the adoption of the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House that which the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has already said, the conference committee had eight meetings. We struggled diligently and to the best of our ability to obtain an agreement in accordance with the bill as it passed this House of Representatives in the first instance. The result of our work is before the House.

Now, there were two or three questions asked the chairman of the committee, one by my distinguished colleague from New York, as to what would happen to an order of the court in the State of New York ordering redistricting which order has been appealed to a higher court, I presume the Supreme Court of the United States.

If this conference report is adopted in the House and in the Senate, and becomes law, that order of court is neutralized. And I cite Chief Justice Marshall, of

the United States, to support that statement.

In 1801 he said in *United States v. Schooner "Peggy"*, 1 Cranch 13, in determining just such a question:

But if subsequent to the judgment and before the decision of the Appellate Court, a law intervenes and positively changes the rule which governs, the law must be obeyed, or its obligation denied. If the law be constitutional. . . I know of no court which can contest its obligation.

This is simply the same principle of law that has caused so much concern in the area of criminal law. After the Supreme Court handed down its new interpretation of the fourth amendment in *Mapp* against Ohio, it held, in *Linkletter* against Walker, that the State and Federal Courts have to apply the new rule of law to any cases still pending on appeal. And after the Supreme Court handed down its new fifth amendment interpretation in *Griffin* against California, it held in *Tehan* against Schott, that the new rule must likewise be applied to all cases pending on appeal. Thus, many courts were forced to reverse decisions of inferior courts, even though these decisions were correct when rendered. The analogy to the present case is clear. The *Schooner Peggy* doctrine dictates that pending court orders would have to be abated.

H.R. 2508 has been much misunderstood by several of its critics. Lest confusion spread among us, the conference report should be explained.

The scope of the conference report is limited to the next two congressional elections. The report is silent as to what happens thereafter. No permanent standards are established. That task lies ahead.

For the next two elections, the bill accomplishes two things: First, it prevents at-large elections—Hawaii and New Mexico excepted, and second, it prevents court-ordered redistricting where no recent official census figures are available.

It does not prevent a legislature from redistricting on its own motion because the legislatures of the States are capable of making their own up-to-date head count which may be used as a legitimate basis for redistricting. The courts, under the report, could still prevent, by injunction, bad faith redistricting by a legislature. But they could not initiate the redistricting process.

It is argued by some that this moratorium on court redistricting is unconstitutional. However, that challenge misconceives the thrust of the report as well as it misses the import of *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1 (1964).

The Constitution does not require the ceremony of redistricting but rather that districts be as equal in population as is practicable. Now, at the present time when the facts of how many live where are not known to us, how can we make the districts equal. If we use the 1960 census figures, will we be moving toward or away from equality of districts?

We do not know. We cannot know. We can only speculate. This bill says that we should wait until we get the facts. That is only commonsense. The ceremony of redistricting in itself has no constitu-

tional merit; it gains merit only when reliable figures are available.

No useful purpose is served by applying a rule when the facts are in doubt.

That doubt can only be officially removed by a Federal census. If a legislature wishes to redistrict on the belief that it can produce its own reliable figures, it may do so—subject to court review as to its faith.

It is perhaps appropriate at this time to recall that in *Johnson* against New Jersey the Supreme Court said that the constitutional mandates of *Miranda* and *Escobedo* were not to be applied retrospectively even to cases on direct appeal because the application of those principles in such a manner would have mischievous results in the administration of the States' criminal laws. The precedent goes much further than H.R. 2508 does, for in *Johnson*, the Court suspended the Constitution in order to prevent chaos; whereas, H.R. 2508 simply withholds the application of a constitutional principle only until the necessary facts may be determined. If the Supreme Court decision in *Johnson* does not violate the Constitution, then a fortiori, neither does H.R. 2508.

In summary, the managers well understood the desire of the Members for a report that would bring stability to the area of concern. It is charged that the report would produce chaos because it is unconstitutional. We have carefully examined that problem. Commonsense is not unconstitutional.

There is no effective bill devisable in this area that a clever person cannot attack as unconstitutional. Do not be lured by the suggestion that some report can be devised which is both more effective and less imbued with doubt. It does not exist.

I recommend the conference committee report to all my colleagues.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. CAHILL. The question is this: That in the State of New Jersey, as the gentleman has said, the Supreme Court has held that the districts under which we have been elected are unconstitutional. The legislature has not redistricted us. If this bill is passed, in my judgment we cannot run at large, so how will New Jersey elect its Representatives?

Mr. McCULLOCH. The legislature may redistrict the State.

Mr. CAHILL. But they have not done it, and they decline to do it.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is my answer to the question, Mr. Speaker. The legislature is not prevented from redistricting the State of New Jersey pursuant to the unreversed order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CAHILL. Yes, but what if they do not?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in fairness I should point out my

main reluctance to the conference report, is the fact that this bill would prevent the court from passing upon redistricting suits between now and 1970 in effect. Also I believe that passage of this bill would do exactly the reverse, of what concerns so many Members here today; namely, forcing members to run at large.

We cannot eliminate at-large contests by this kind of conference report.

So in the last minutes of this debate I would urge my colleagues to vote down this report so we can finally pass a districting bill which is constitutional.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 2508 was first brought to the floor of this House, I was compelled to vote against it. Its proposed population standards departed markedly from several significant court decisions and, indeed, it raised doubts as to the jurisdiction of Federal courts in redistricting cases.

The conference report offered today for approval represents an undisguised attempt to oust the Federal courts of all jurisdiction over congressional redistricting for a period which could exceed 5 years. The report is devoid of any population standards. It fails to require compactness in the formulation of congressional districts. The report fails even to preserve the worst elements of a House bill which left a great deal to be desired when its passage was secured.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this report is totally unacceptable to those of us who believe that the U.S. Constitution guarantees to the American people the full application of the concept of "one man, one vote." There is little, in my judgment, that can be said in defense of this attempt to subvert our constitutional guarantees. It is my hope that the Members of this body will put principle above short-term political gain and defeat this proposal today.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state unequivocally my opposition to the congressional redistricting conference report which is now up for our consideration after a 5-month delay. I feel that the conference report is a giant step backward and raises very serious constitutional questions.

I think that we have had enough time to carry out the mandate of the Constitution—as well as the several Supreme Court rulings of the past 5 years—to provide equal representation in the House of Representatives for all the people. This conference report is considerably less desirable than the original House measure and little resembles the Senate version.

We in the Congress have a responsibility to the citizens of this country to protect and insure their rights and privileges as guaranteed by the Constitution. We owe to our constituents an equal voice in choosing their representative in Congress. This conference report does not live up to this high ideal. It violates the spirit and intent of the Constitution and it completely ignores the great responsibility we bear to enact an equitable and reasonable bill.

Although time grows short, Mr. Speaker, it is not too late to go back to con-

ference and report out a fair and logical compromise. We can do no less than this.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference committee report, and to point out as has been emphasized by the chairman of the committee and by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] that from time to time we had meetings to try to resolve the issues. At one time we did bring in a report which then went back to conference again.

The only reason we did not draw standards to apply from now until 1972 or censuses thereafter is because the conferees could not agree on that one little phrase "as determined by the State." After many meetings it was agreed that we could not arrive at a determination.

But there is a necessity for the Congress to take some action, first, to see that the congressional districts are divided within the State except the two States of Hawaii and New Mexico. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is that the 1960 census is not realistic. The only thing we are saying here is to get an up-to-date census if you are going to reapportion in the State.

There have been questions raised as to constitutionality. May I say that the Constitution itself provides that the apportionment shall be made to the State.

There is nothing in this report and nothing in the answers as given by the gentleman from New York which would in any manner attack a court that determines a reapportionment on a constitutional situation. There is nothing in this conference report that will do it and there is no attempt to violate the one-man, one-vote rule.

The thing we are saying is that we are trying to give a guideline to meet an issue that has plagued us since the Supreme Court announced the so-called one-man, one-vote theory or rule. The purpose of this is to still continue within that guideline and with that in view we hope that you will adopt this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MACGREGOR moves to recommit the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2508) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on substituting (for the matter set

forth in such report) the matter which was contained in the first section of the previous conference report (H. Rept. No. 435) submitted on the bill plus a provision substantially as follows:

"In each State entitled in the Ninety-First Congress and the Ninety-Second Congress to more than one Representative under an apportionment made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929, entitled 'An Act to provide for apportionment of Representatives' (46 Stat. 26), as amended, there shall be established by law a number of districts equal to the number of Representatives to which such State is so entitled, and Representatives shall be elected only from districts so established, no district to elect more than one Representative."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 82, nays 283, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

YEAS—82

Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Reuss
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gardner	Riegle
Battin	Gross	Robison
Blester	Grover	Roth
Bingham	Gubser	Rumsfeld
Blackburn	Gude	St. Germain
Brock	Gurney	Schadeberg
Brown, Mich.	Hall	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Heckler, Mass.	Schwengel
Broyhill, Va.	Hunt	Snyder
Buchanan	Hutchinson	Stafford
Bush	Jonas	Steiger, Ariz.
Cahill	Kastenmeier	Steiger, Wis.
Carey	Kelly	Talcott
Carter	Kleppe	Teague, Calif.
Chamberlain	Kuykendall	Thomson, Wis.
Cleveland	McEwen	Tiernan
Collier	MacGregor	Udall
Cowger	Mailliard	Vander Jagt
Cunningham	Mayne	Wampler
Curtis	Meskill	Widnall
Dellenback	Moore	Wiggins
Denney	Morse, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Derwinski	Morton	Wydler
Duncan	O'Konski	Wyman
Dwyer	Patten	Zion
Edwards, Ala.	Pike	Zwach
	Price, Tex.	

NAYS—283

Abernethy	Bevill	Cabell
Adair	Blanton	Casey
Adams	Blatnik	Cederberg
Addabbo	Boland	Celler
Albert	Bolling	Clancy
Anderson, Tenn.	Bolton	Clark
Andrews, Ala.	Bow	Clausen,
Annunzio	Brademas	Don H.
Arends	Brasco	Clawson, Del.
Ashbrook	Brinkley	Colmer
Ashley	Brooks	Conable
Ayres	Brown, Ohio	Conte
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Conyers
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Cramer
Bates	Burleson	Culver
Belcher	Burton, Calif.	Daddario
Bennett	Burton, Utah	Daniels
Berry	Button	Davis, Ga.
Betts	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Wis.
	Byrnes, Wls.	de la Garza

Delaney	Kee	Price, Ill.
Devine	Keith	Pucinski
Dingell	King, Calif.	Purcell
Dole	King, N.Y.	Rallsback
Donohue	Kirwan	Randall
Dorn	Kornegay	Rees
Dow	Kupferman	Reid, Ill.
Dowdy	Kyros	Reid, N.Y.
Dulski	Laird	Reifel
Eckhardt	Landrum	Reinecke
Edmondson	Langen	Resnick
Edwards, Calif.	Latta	Rhodes, Pa.
Ellberg	Leggett	Rivers
Esch	Lennon	Roberts
Eshleman	Lloyd	Rodino
Evans, Colo.	Long, Md.	Rogers, Colo.
Fallon	Lukens	Rogers, Fla.
Farbstein	McCarthy	Ronan
Fascell	McClary	Rooney, N.Y.
Feighan	McClure	Rooney, Pa.
Findley	McCulloch	Rosenthal
Flood	McDade	Rostenkowski
Flynt	McDonald,	Roush
Foley	Mich.	Roybal
Ford, Gerald R.	McMillan	Ryan
Fraser	Macdonald,	Sandman
Frelinghuysen	Mass.	Satterfield
Friedel	Machen	Saylor
Fulton, Pa.	Madden	Scheuer
Gallifanakis	Mahon	Schneebell
Gallagher	Marsh	Schweiker
Garmatz	Mathias, Calif.	Scott
Gathings	Mathias, Md.	Selden
Gettys	Matsunaga	Shipley
Gialmo	May	Shriver
Gibbons	Meeds	Sikes
Gilbert	Michel	Slisk
Gonzalez	Miller, Ohio	Skubitz
Goodell	Mills	Slack
Goodling	Minish	Smith, Calif.
Gray	Mink	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Minshall	Smith, N.Y.
Green, Pa.	Mize	Smith, Okla.
Griffiths	Monagan	Springer
Hagan	Montgomery	Stanton
Halley	Moorhead	Steed
Halpern	Morgan	Stephens
Hamilton	Morris, N. Mex.	Stratton
Hanley	Mosher	Stubblefield
Hansen, Idaho	Multer	Sullivan
Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, Ill.	Taft
Hardy	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor
Harrison	Myers	Teague, Tex.
Harsha	Natcher	Thompson, N.J.
Harvey	Nedzi	Tuck
Hays	Nelsen	Tunney
Hechler, W. Va.	Nichols	Van Deerlin
Helstoski	Nix	Vanik
Henderson	O'Hara, Ill.	Waggonner
Hicks	O'Hara, Mich.	Walker
Hollifield	Olsen	Watson
Horton	O'Neal, Ga.	Whalen
Howard	O'Neill, Mass.	Whalley
Hull	Ottinger	White
Hungate	Passman	Whitener
Ichord	Patman	Whitten
Irwin	Pelly	Williams, Pa.
Jacobs	Pepper	Winn
Jarman	Perkins	Wolf
Joelson	Pettis	Wright
Johnson, Calif.	Philbin	Wyatt
Johnson, Pa.	Pickle	Wylie
Jones, Ala.	Pirnie	Yates
Jones, N.C.	Poage	Young
Karsh	Poff	Zablocki
Kazen	Pool	

NOT VOTING—67

Abbt	Fountain	Pryor
Ashmore	Fulton, Tenn.	Quile
Aspinall	Fuqua	Quillen
Bell	Halleck	Rarick
Boggs	Hammer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bray	Schmidt	Roudebush
Broomfield	Hanna	Ruppe
Brotzman	Hathaway	St. Onge
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Staggers
Cobelan	Hebert	Stuckey
Corbett	Herlong	Tenzer
Corman	Holland	Thompson, Ga.
Dawson	Hosmer	Ullman
Dent	Jones, Mo.	Utt
Dickinson	Karsten	Vigorito
Diggs	Kluczynski	Waldie
Downing	Kyl	Watkins
Edwards, La.	Lipscomb	Watts
Everett	Long, La.	Williams, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Willis
Fino	Martin	Wilson,
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Ford,	Moss	
William D.	Pollock	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Hammerschmidt for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. William D. Ford for, with Mr. Hathaway against.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Pollock against.

Mr. Kyl for, with Mr. Bray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Quile.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Evins of Tennessee.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Charles H. Willson.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Brown of California.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Downing.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pryor.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Karsten.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Tenzer.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Waldie.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Martin.

Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. SCHEUER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GROVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 106, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

YEAS—241

Abernethy Brown, Ohio
Adair Broyhill, N.C.
Addabbo Broyhill, Va.
Albert Buchanan
Anderson, Burke, Fla.
Tenn. Burke, Mass.
Andrews, Ala. Burleson
Annunzio Button
Arends Byrne, Pa.
Ashbrook Byrnes, Wis.
Ashley Carter
Ayres Casey
Baring Cederberg
Barrett Celler
Bates Chamberlain
Belcher Clancy
Bennett Clark
Betts Clausen,
Bevill Don H.
Blester Clawson, Del.
Blanton Collier
Bolton Colmer
Bow Conable
Brademas Cramer
Brinkley Daddario
Brooks Davis, Ga.
Brown, Mich. Davis, Wis.

Gathings
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Holifield
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kyro
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McMillan

Adams
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Battin
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brasco
Brook
Bush
Cahill
Carey
Cleveland
Conte
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daniels
Dellenback
Denney
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Esch
Farbstein
Feighan
Fraser
Gallagher
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.

Abbitt
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bell
Berry
Blackburn
Boggs
Bray
Broomfield
Brotzman

Macdonald,
Mass.
Machen
Madden
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
Olson
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Purcell
Rallsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Relfel
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.

NAYS—106

Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Halpern
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Hunt
Joelson
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kleppe
Kupferman
Kuykendall
McCarthy
McDonald,
Mich.
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mayne
Minish
Moore
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patten
Pettis
Pike

NOT VOTING—85

Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Cabell
Cohelan
Corbett
Corman
Dawson
Dent
Dickinson

Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Halleck
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hébert
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Hosmer
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
King, N.Y.

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Hathaway for, with Mr. William D. Ford against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Hammerschmidt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Fino.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Karsten with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Quillen.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Quile.

Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Pryor.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Rarick.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Downing.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Hicks.

Mr. DANIELS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the conference re-

port accompanying the bill, H.R. 2508, which was just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1499. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the explorations of Father Jacques Marquette in what is now the United States of America;

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10105. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of the State of Mississippi;

H.R. 10160. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion; and

H.R. 13212. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of San Diego.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10345) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12474) entitled "An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished mi-

nority leader, the only business for tomorrow is the joint meeting of the Congress to hear the address of our distinguished visitor, the president of Mexico.

The business for next week is as follows:

On Monday: H.R. 10915, reduction of extra-long-staple cotton quota, on which consideration will be continued.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 12144, Federal Meat Inspection Act Amendments. This will be taken up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

S. 1985, National Flood Insurance Act of 1967. This will be brought up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

H.R. 5754, relating to interstate shipments of intoxicating liquors, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

S. 780, Air Quality Act of 1967, open rule, 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment.

H.R. 12603, National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1967, which is subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made, of course, subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader give us any guidance—I know it is difficult—on the continuing resolution?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I can advise the Members that that matter will not be on the floor before Monday next. Members may be assured of that fact.

ORDER TO ADJOURN OVER FROM TOMORROW TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 30

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VISIT OF MARION LADY CHESHAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next week Washington will be visited by an old and beloved friend, the gracious American-born lady Congresswoman from Tanzania, Marion Lady Chesham, now a distinguished and eloquent member of the National Assembly of Tanzania. I count Lady Marion as one of my close friends as she is that of many of my colleagues, especially on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Lady Marion will be entertained at a morning coffee and I do hope the arrangement of legislative business at the time will permit a large attendance from the membership of the House. All Members are cordially invited. Early next week during the 1-minute speech session I will make announcement of the place and hour.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following news article from the New York Times of October 22, 1967:

TANZANIAN HERE TO EXPLAIN POLICY

(By Edward C. Burks)

She is chic, witty, urbane and of a wealthy Philadelphia background, so it is a little surprising to learn that in Tanzania she is widely known as "Mama."

In fact she is a Tanzanian citizen, a member of the National Assembly, a prime mover in self-help programs there, and presently on a goodwill mission to this country "to explain current Tanzanian policies."

She is Marion Lady Chesham, the former Marion Donoghue of the Chestnut Hill section of Philadelphia, who first went to the East African country in 1938 as the wife of a British baron.

Now in her sixties, she is a proponent of President Julius K. Nyerere's announced policy of national "self-reliance." But she does not hesitate to criticize "our mistakes."

"Tanzania seems to have got the reputation through some American press accounts of being Communist," she said during an interview last week at the Cosmopolitan Club, 122 East 66th Street.

She sees her current six-week mission to this country as primarily to explain that Tanzania, a nation of 10 million, is not leaning to the Communist bloc and is not anti-American despite some misunderstandings. She is also seeking funds for a community development program that she heads and for a campaign to increase adult literacy.

A gray-haired woman who lightly sprinkles "damns" and "dears" through her conversation, she said matter of factly: "England is a damned sight more Socialist than Tanzania, but ours is a form of socialism that befits a new country." Banks and some major industries have been nationalized.

She compares Tanzania's policy of no strings on aid and no foreign entanglements with the attitude that the young United States had in George Washington's time against getting involved with European powers.

American Peace Corps workers in Tanzania have been criticized by President Nyerere and sharply denounced by the Youth League of the President's party, the Tanzania African National Union.

Commenting on the Youth League action, Lady Chesham said, "It was a silly resolution against the Peace Corps, but the youth leader ended up in jail, and the President's brother is now in charge."

There is no longer a need for Peace Corps teachers in the growing primary school sys-

tem—"they don't know enough Swahili"—but "we need them in agricultural and health programs," she said.

Lady Chesham and her husband settled permanently in what was then called Tanganyika in 1946 on a 1,400-acre farm and ranch near Iringa in the south, more than 400 miles from the capital at Dar es Salaam. After her husband died in 1952, she stayed on in the country, which she found so friendly, and got interested in politics.

Tribesmen and villagers of her area gave her a name meaning "friend from far away," later, after she turned over her estate to the workers and gave her sprawling home as a training center for community development programs, she became widely known as "Mama."

Backed by Mr. Nyerere she ran for the colonial Legislature in 1958 when Tanganyika was still a British colony and promptly lost her American citizenship on taking the oath of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth. Explaining to the American consul her decision to run for election and to vote, she said, "Sweetie, I can't do things in a half-baked way."

She was re-elected in 1960, the year before independence, and in the 1965 elections she returned to the Assembly as one of the 10 representatives at large that the President may nominate.

More than half of the funds for her community self-help program come from the United States; the bulk from the Community Development Foundation. Major programs of her trust fund include setting up community centers, digging wells and providing emergency assistance and high school scholarships for students.

SPEECH BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Monday evening I was privileged to have attended a dinner at the Sherman House Hotel in Chicago honoring a fine American, the Honorable Paul H. Douglas. Senator Douglas received the Excellence in Politics Award from the Committee on Illinois Government, who sponsored the affair.

The main speaker was the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, of New York, who delivered what has been described as a "sparkling speech, one of his finest oratorical efforts," by Irv Kupcinet, of the Chicago Sun-Times.

I endorse Kup's opinion of the Senator from New York, who is proving to be a young man of great vision. The speech is worthy of our attention, and I insert it at this point in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK, AT A DINNER IN HONOR OF SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS, GIVEN BY THE COMMITTEE ON ILLINOIS GOVERNMENT, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 23, 1967

Scarcely a week goes by, in these United States, without a dinner in someone's honor. Once in a great while, perhaps a few times in each generation, such a dinner is given in the name of a man who is not as much honored by the tribute, as his choice honors those who gather to praise him.

Such a man is Paul Douglas. What we say tonight will add no luster to his name; for his work through a lifetime of public serv-

ice, sets the standard of excellence for the rest of us to follow in years to come.

So nothing could give me more pleasure than to join in this dinner; an honor greater because of the Committee of Illinois Government. This is, I believe, the most vital and necessary of institutions. For it is often hard, in the absence of immediate danger, to maintain our attention, to renew our energy and determination to meet the critical and complex challenges of modern American life. But this Committee at once symbolizes the ability of the American people to meet the challenges, and spurs our efforts to do so. President Kennedy once observed to a dinner of Nobel Prize winners that never had so much talent been present at a White House function—except perhaps when Thomas Jefferson dined alone. Tonight I have no hesitation in saying that seldom has such a collection of energy and ability been committed to the cure of our domestic ills as is present in this Committee—except perhaps when Paul Douglas stood and fought alone.

As a freshman Senator, he once expressed a wish to mark out "the moments where . . . the arc of our lives meets the tangent of eternity". That he did, in many times and places.

Paul Douglas exemplifies at once the oldest virtues and the most modern thought of the nation he has served so well. Therefore, let us all thank him, for the opportunity to do honor to ourselves by rendering him this award.

But more than this, we can and must thank him in another way—by committing ourselves to the fulfillment of the goal for which he has so courageously and consistently fought: building a community of justice, decency, and excellence throughout the United States.

This is no easy matter, no immediate vision turned into the next day's fact. For seldom have our historic goals and ideals seemed more difficult of achievement. We have passed civil rights legislation of a reach and detail unknown since the Civil War; yet never has there been a greater sense of alienation or more open hostility between the races. We have found material wealth, and government programs, far beyond our dreams of a few years ago; yet perhaps we count the wrong things, for the forms of the new wealth seem to destroy as many pleasures as they bring to us—and the new programs seem irrelevant, even hostile, to many of the purposes they were designed to achieve.

Most dangerous of all, millions of Americans—who can say how many—have lost confidence in each other, and in their ability to shape their own fate, their community's development, or their nation's course. Everywhere I go in this country I find people groping for the answers to questions we barely understand: searching for purpose in the midst of baffling change, confusion and danger. We are losing many of our most active and committed young to extreme movements or public indifference. We are losing members of the older generation, who are turning to the past in order at least to protect what they have. The Minutemen, and the Revolutionary Armed Movement, agree only on one thing—that they have the right to use guns and violence against fellow-citizens with whom they disagree. More and more, debate is not an interchange of views but a dialogue of the deaf, often serving to demonstrate differences but not to reconcile them. We confront even those with whom we sympathize across barriers of hostility and mistrust.

Of all these divisions, none is more fateful and dangerous than the deepening division between white and black America. This division has bred riot and repression, sending violence and fear across the country, leaving death and devastation behind. The weather now is cool. But we know that if action is not taken in the leisure and calm of winter, the next turning of the seasons

may become a grotesque spiral of greater violence and even greater vengeance, threatening the well-being and liberties of every citizen.

What are the sources of this terribly division? It begins in a failure of understanding and communication.

We live in different worlds and gaze out over a different landscape. Through the eyes of the white man, the Negro world is one of steady and continuous progress. In a few years, he has seen the entire structure of discriminatory legislation torn down. He has heard Presidents become spokesmen for racial justice, while Negro Americans enter the Cabinet and the Supreme Court. The white American has paid taxes for poverty and education programs, and watched his children risk their lives to register voters in Mississippi. Seeing this, he asks, what cause can there be for violent insurrection, or dissatisfaction with present progress?

But if we try to look through the eyes of the young slum-dweller—the Negro, and the Puerto Rican, and the Mexican-American—the world is a dark and hopeless place indeed.

Let us look for a moment.

The chances are he was born into a family without a father—often as a result of welfare laws which require a broken home as a condition of help. His chance of dying in the first year of life is twice that of children born outside the ghetto; his chances of being mentally retarded are seven times the community average. He may spend his childhood crowded with adults into one or two rooms, without adequate plumbing or heat, with rats his companions of the night.

He goes to a school which teaches little that helps him in an alien world. His chances are 3 out of 10 of graduating from high school—and if he does graduate, there is only a 50-50 chance that he will have even the equivalent of an 8th-grade education. A young college graduate who taught in a ghetto school sums it up this way: "The books are junk, the paint peels, the cellar stinks, the teachers call you nigger, the window falls in on your head."

Worst of all, the people of the ghetto and the barrio live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the nation knew during the depth of the Great Depression. If the unemployment of the Depression was a national emergency—and it was—our cities today therefore envelop dozens of more severe emergencies. The official statistics tell us that unemployment in the ghettos of poverty is over three times the national rate. But these figures do not count the full extent of the problem, because the whole apparatus of government cannot even find from one-fifth to one-third of the adult men of the ghetto. These men are unknown, have no fixed address, no job. They drift about the city, separated from their families, as if they were of no greater concern to their fellows than so many sparrows or spent matches. When these lost battalions are taken into account, as well as those men who have lost hope and stopped looking for work, the true unemployment rate in the typical ghetto is not ten percent, or fifteen percent, but over forty percent. If that were the rate of unemployment nationwide, there would be 30 million people out of work today instead of 3 million. And of those men of the ghetto who do have jobs, over a fourth earn less than \$60 a week—earn less, that is, than is required for each member of a family of four to eat 70 cents worth of food a day; less than what a family of that size receives on welfare in many cities.

And the 1967 Manpower Report, states flatly that "economic and social conditions are getting worse, not better, in slum areas"; the Labor Department has explained that the youth of the slums "just don't have the connections."

There are, of course, connections they can

make. For a few blocks away or on a television set, the young man can watch the multiplying marvels of white America: new cars and new homes, air conditioners and outdoor barbecues. Every day television commercials tell him that life is impossible without the latest products of our consumer society. But he cannot buy them. He is told that the Negro is making progress. But what does that mean to him? He cannot experience the progress of others, nor should we seriously expect him to feel grateful because he is no longer a slave, or because he can vote or eat at some lunch counters. For he compares his condition not with the past, but with the life of other Americans. He and his brothers, as Daniel O'Connell said of the Irish, "have been made more thirsty for liberty by the drop that has fallen on their parched lips." Now as ever, it is when submission gives way to expectation, when despair is touched with the awareness of possibility, that the forces of human desire and the passion for justice are unloosed.

How overwhelming must the frustration of this young man—this young American—who, desperately wanting to believe and half believing, finds himself locked in the slums, his education second-rate, unable to get a job, confronted by the open prejudice and subtle hostilities of a white world, and seemingly powerless to change his condition or shape his future. Others tell him to work his way up as other minorities have done; and so he must. For he knows, and we know, that only by his own efforts and his own labor will he come to full equality. But how is he to work? The jobs have fled to the suburbs, or been replaced by machines, or have moved beyond the reach of those with limited education and skills.

He feels denied membership in that American society to which by birth and natural allegiance he belongs. And it is precisely among the most vital and determined young men that frustration is greatest. Here, and not in the frantic charade of revolutionary oratory, is the breeding ground of black nationalism and "reverse racism." The violent youth of the ghetto is not simply protesting his condition, but trying to assert his worth and dignity as a human being—to tell us that though we may scorn his contribution, we must still respect his power.

But this is the most destructive and self-defeating of attempts. This is not revolution. The word means to seize power, but the advocates of violence are not going to overthrow the American government; when Rap Brown threatens "to burn America down," he is not a revolutionary, he is an anarchist. The end is not a better life for Negroes, but a devastated America: as William Pfaff has said, "a program for death, not life." So it has already proven, all over the face of America.

We cannot abandon the young Negro to this kind of leadership, or let the voice of his protest turn into such despair. We must act—and the fact is that we can.

For Americans are not cruel or unjust or indifferent to suffering. The whole chronicle of our nation records the ultimate triumph of compassion and the spread of opportunity. Those are, and they remain, the basic instincts of the American people. What we must do is to build new bridges of trust and cooperation in a mutual commitment to justice. We can begin with a dialogue—between black and white Americans—which will reveal the misery of the one and liberate the fundamental decency of the other.

But dialogue requires more than words, and more than sentiments of brotherhood. We must demonstrate good faith with forceful action. The tasks before us—the opportunities to improve the lot of the poor and the life of the nation—are almost endless: we need to learn to build an educational system, far different in quality and kind, able to meet the specific needs of educational pov-

erty; a national system of hospital clinics and insurance, to guarantee that all American children have the chance to grow straight and strong; the development of basic housing at costs within the budgets of all; a police system with the confidence of all the people of the community because it protects and defends them all with firm efficiency and respect. There are many new ideas, to be assessed and debated and tested. But most of all, there are things we can—and must do—immediately.

The first is an impact project designed to put men to work and to restore hope to the young and to give the unemployed resident of the city slum some sense of dignity and promise. We should begin immediate programs of needed public tasks and works—providing jobs to build schools and roads, to restore parks and erect clinics, and to staff the schools and clinics and neighborhood centers when they are built. Our communities need these jobs done, and the men of the ghetto need jobs. By matching the two we can return hope while meeting the most urgent needs of the nation. A broad program in this direction was narrowly defeated in the Senate a few weeks ago—and never have we more sharply missed the leadership that Paul Douglas once gave us there.

Second, we must turn the power and resources of our private enterprise system to the underdeveloped nation within our midst. This should be done by bringing into the ghettos themselves productive and profitable private industry—creating dignified jobs, not welfare handouts, for the men and youth who now languish in idleness. To do this, private enterprise will require incentives—credits, accelerated depreciation, and extra deductions—as effective and comprehensive as those we now offer for the production of oil or the building of grain storage facilities or the supersonic transport.

I have introduced two bills to this end, which would create the necessary system of tax incentives for investment in the ghetto. They are not the complete answer; they may well not be the best answer. But what is far beyond doubt is that the resources and abilities of private industry, and not just the federal treasury and bureaucracy, must be engaged in this great task.

What we have done to enhance the interests of the powerful—we can and must do to preserve the power of the nation.

Third, all the efforts of Washington will come to little without the leadership that can only be provided in communities all across the nation—creating and energizing the programs, building the housing and industry, teaching the children, above all rebuilding our sense of community—our willingness to meet and touch across the gaps which divide us. Here in Chicago, you are fortunate to have one element of that leadership in Mayor Daley. But it requires more than one man. It requires vigorous and courageous leadership in every place where decisions are made and debate carried on—in every legislature and school board and business council—leadership which dares to speak out before it tests the shifting wind of popular anger and confusion; that leadership which prefers facts to illusions, action to sullen withdrawal, sacrifice and effort to indulgence and ease. For when the enemy is at the gates, who will reward the messenger that comforts the people?

And there is, after all, no alternative. History has placed us all, black and white, rich and poor, within a common border and under a common law. All of us, from the wealthiest to the young children I have seen bloated by starvation—we all share one precious possession: the name "American". It is not easy to know what that means. But in part to be an American means to have been an outcast and a stranger, to have come to the exiles' country, and to know that he who denies

the outcast and stranger still among us, at that moment also denies America.

That Paul Douglas has never done. For those of us who gather in his name tonight, there could be no higher purpose, no greater tribute, than to take from his example the determination to call on the best in our people to perform our duty with courage and conviction, to enrich the lives of all our citizens. This has been our tradition. We shall follow it again, because it is right. And to that kind of commitment, we know the American people will respond.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH TO OUR WATER POLLUTION PROBLEM

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced two bills to stop pollution in the Great Lakes, but they affect other navigable waters as well. My principal reason for sponsoring these bills is to attempt to bring a commonsense approach to the problem. I have studied with growing concern how my own Lake Michigan is being daily flooded with domestic and industrial wastes, with acids and oil, with detergents and debris, and with the discharge from large ships and pleasure boats. My bills would stop pollution from lake ports, Federal installations, vessels of all kinds, detergents, and from the dumping of oil.

Practically every important water resource in this country is already polluted to some extent or seriously threatened. Some of our rivers are little better than open sewers. Some of our lakes—notably Lake Erie—are threatened with extinction from pollution. It has taken many years of neglect for the water problems of the Great Lakes region to attain the present state of crisis. As in other areas of normally sufficient precipitation, the superb water resources of the Great Lakes were taken for granted, and a general feeling of public apathy prevailed with respect to water resources. Many people were shocked, therefore, when in 1961, the U.S. Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, on the basis of a study, concluded that the western Great Lakes Basin would be a water deficit area by the end of the 20th century. This result was projected because man is using and abusing the available water at an ever-increasing rate, and his uses will have outstripped the new water supplies arising in the basin by the end of the century. The most critical of the water problems in the Great Lakes is pollution, stemming from the increasing use of waterways for waste disposal.

Thirty-six years ago, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said:

A river is more than an amenity, it is a treasure.

We are just beginning to realize the truth of his words and I wonder what superlatives he would have supplied had

his utterance been directed to an evaluation of the Great Lakes.

When a river becomes polluted, it is possible to bring it back to its former degree of purity because of the constant flow of water. When a lake becomes polluted, since it is a stationary body of water with very little current to flush the pollution away, the damage is thought to be irretrievable. Every day of continued emptying of pollution into the Great Lakes reduces forever a portion of that degree of purity which the lake had when the early settlers first arrived upon its shores.

I spoke of a commonsense approach to the problem. This is to stop—and to stop immediately—any further violation of these greatest of our natural resources. My approach exactly is to turn off the valves that are pouring ruin into the lakes.

The lakes have been a dumping ground for so long that it is inconceivable to many that such a course is possible, but Mr. Speaker, this is really the only answer. On the shores of Lake Michigan, there are some 42 major ports which have been dumping sewage, which was less than adequately treated, into the lake waters for more than 100 years. The sewage systems of many of these cities are largely to blame. Even in cities where sewage treatment plants have been constructed, the antiquity of the sewer system allows any runoff from a storm to wash raw untreated sewage into the lake.

In Green Bay, Wis., they are pumping drinking water from 35 miles out in the lake because the waters adjacent to the shore are fouled beyond any level of potability. I would like to ask these cities to close down their sewer outlets right now, but I know that is impossible. What is possible, however, is to have every one of these cities put in adequate sewage treatment plants, and adequate storm drainage systems.

As of now, 30 percent of the municipalities in this country have primary sewer treatment plants. This primary plant merely screens debris and separates solids in a settling tank. It removes approximately 35 percent of organic pollutants from sewage water. Today 50 percent of the municipalities have secondary treatment plants. The secondary treatment plant destroys organic wastes through bacteriological action and a coarse stone filter. The effluent from this secondary treatment is then treated with chlorine and discharged. This treatment removes up to 90 percent of organic pollutants from sewage water. In this country there are 7,500 communities which have sewage treatment plants. Four thousand more are desperately needed.

Success in the sewer and sewer treatment process area would contribute significantly to the control of algae in the Great Lakes. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 authorized, for the first time, direct Federal assistance for research in this field. The authorization was \$20 million a year for 3 years. Another research and demonstration program, started under the Water Quality Act of 1965 and continued by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, attempts to find practicable means of deal-

ing with the immensely difficult problem of combined sewers, those that carry both sewage and storm water runoff. A breakthrough in this area would shorten the water cleanup task by years and save billions of dollars that would otherwise be spent in separating combined sewers.

Advanced waste treatment is very definitely a research area of significant and growing importance. We know enough already to produce better water out of municipal wastes than is coming out of the taps in many communities. As a case in point, in Santee, Calif., an area not known for an abundance of water, the effluent from a highly sophisticated filter plant has been used to create a large fresh-water lake. The lake abounds in fish and provides boating and swimming facilities for the community. I cite this to show that sewage treatment can be perfected to even those high standards.

One of my bills provides for this stoppage of sewage and gives a 60-day period for accomplishing the improvement in sewage treatment.

Throughout the country and throughout the Great Lakes, there are a number of Government-owned and Government-operated installations, which, like the cities mentioned, are using the lakes to empty their sewage. We may not be able to have instant cooperation from city governments but we have effective and immediate control over our Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Federal Government. If, in fact, Federal installations are contributing to the destruction of the lakes, it should not be tolerated for even 1 more day. This bill would provide for the prohibition against Federal dumping of untreated sewage if that condition has not been corrected. It would also provide for the immediate cessation of dredging by Government employees in the Great Lakes.

Not only do cities and Federal installations contribute to the worsening situation but the shipping and boat traffic on the lakes has increased tremendously in the last decade. The magnitude of the problem posed by ships and boats is that a yearly average of 40,000 foreign and domestic vessels of all sizes ply the Great Lakes. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway opened the lakes up to deep-draft vessels. In all the waters of the United States, there are 8 million recreational craft. It is estimated that over a million are in use on the Great Lakes. Each vessel or pleasure boat contributes its share of raw sewage to the Great Lakes. It is estimated that the discharge of all vessels in the United States for 1 day would equal the untreated discharge from a city the size of Buffalo or Cincinnati.

The discharge is not limited to sewage but boats and ships are expelling large quantities of oil and grease and bulk garbage and trash. In recent weeks, Lake Michigan has been covered with a massive oil slick which has caused considerable damage to beaches as well as to pleasure craft.

In order to demonstrate what trouble oil discharge can mean, one has only to recall the discharge from the sunken tanker *Torrey Canyon* on the coast of England. It fouled the beaches, killed marine life, and threatened the whole

economy of beach resorts. In this country, oil slicks off the coast of New York and New England have taken a heavy toll of waterfowl.

In order to control the discharge from boats and ships, my bill would place responsibility upon the Secretary of the Interior to issue appropriate regulations.

The primary control of this source of pollution lies in the retention of all such oil, sewage, and refuse aboard such vessels until it can be safely discharged at a port facility providing for such disposition. The Coast Guard would be assigned the task of enforcing and implementing these regulations.

As supplementary to the command to stop pollution, my proposed tax bill seeks ways of not only preventing the inflow of pollutants, but also to study methods for the removal of pollution. This is an important provision because it is an attempt to regain the purity of the lake water, which, unlike the reclamation of a river, is thought to be impossible. Pollution comes from overfertilization in the water, which causes excessive growth of vegetation, which, in turn, removes the dissolved oxygen from the water. If some way can be found to control and remove the excessive growth of vegetation, the balance of oxygen content will start to return to normal. It is the loss of oxygen that determines whether water is polluted or not. It is the opinion of ichthyologists that the alewives that have been washed up on Lake Michigan's shores in large numbers this past summer were the victims of the oxygen deficiency and from consuming toxic vegetation.

Another source contributing greatly to the pollution of the Great Lakes is the synthetic detergent. Every housewife in the country who can be reached by radio and television is a user of some form of detergent. Such detergents cause trouble in their indestructibility. They resist breakdown under sewage treatment processes and this lack of decomposability can be seen in foaming septic fields and the froth-covered rivers into which they pour. The synthetic detergent pollutes both surface and ground waters, is toxic to fish and plants, and accelerates the growth of algae.

The soap and detergent industry in 1963, announced plans to convert from hard to soft synthetic detergents. This conversion was completed by July 1965. Although this change eliminated the suds problem, it did not eliminate phosphate content in these detergents. The increase in the introduction of phosphates into our waters has increased manifold since World War II. We are using in our homes today detergents which were only used commercially before World War II. These detergents contain as much as 50 percent phosphate. We are using annually 4 billion pounds of phosphate in this form. Water filtration and treatment plants are largely ineffective in removing this pollutant.

My bill would provide for the setting up of a committee of industrial chemists to look into methods and recommend minimum standards for decomposability of commercially marketed detergents. The bill also will provide for a

study financed through Federal loans and grants to develop detergents which are free from phosphate. When and if a product is developed or when a minimum standard of phosphate content is defined which is within the capability of the majority of manufacturers, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue the necessary regulations to keep nonconforming products off the market.

Another main source of pollution in the Great Lakes lies in the oil spilled from ships and boats, from terminal facilities, and from steel companies and refineries. The legislation covering this area; namely, the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, leaves much to be desired in the means of enforcement. That act, as written, applies to only "grossly negligent or willful spilling" of oil. It is now practically impossible to convict under this act because proof of gross negligence and willfulness in this type of activity depends upon microscopically close surveillance and the probing of subjective thought processes. The point that is of importance is not in establishing some less difficult burden of proof for law enforcement officials but in keeping the oil out of the water. My bill would make the spilling of oil an absolute liability on the person so handling. If it is spilled by accident the person would be liable for a fine. Under my bill, a jail sentence could only be imposed in the case of negligence or an intentional violation.

One of the great complaints in cases of accidental or other discharges of oil is the property damage to lakeside residents and to pleasure boats. In addition to criminal sanctions against oil spillage, I have included a provision for treble damages in a civil action by the damaged party against a person convicted under this act. The conviction would constitute a prima facie presumption that the damage was in fact, caused by the convicted party.

Finally, in order to induce businesses to do that which rightly should be done, a companion bill provides a tax incentive for the development of water pollution control facilities. A credit against tax to the extent of 15 percent of the cost of such facility would be allowed for the taxable year. This credit would be mutually exclusive of the investment credit and could be carried back 3 years and forward 7 years to the extent not used.

The type of facility for which a credit of this kind would be allowed would be any type of depreciable property which would prevent the introduction of nutrients into the water and or any kind that could be used to purify or reestablish the oxygen content in the water.

Provision is made for certification of the facility appropriate State and Federal agencies to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

These approaches cover the main abuses committed against the Great Lakes and their future use by many generations of Americans. If we can make this start, or to put it more exactly, if we can make this stop to these sources of pollution, we will have taken the most important step in saving material assets more valuable to man than any of us can calculate.

THE PROTESTERS AND THE HEROES

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, unless and until Congress declares this Nation to be in a state of war with North Vietnam, protests against our involvement are entirely legal. Honest dissent must not be equated with treason.

The conduct of many of those who participated in the weekend's demonstrations against the Pentagon was, however, nothing less than mutiny and leaves a mark of shame on the Nation's history. Why the Military District of Washington should solicitously deny that it has used tear gas is not clear, for it would have been justified in resorting to far more drastic measures to protect the troops from contact with the mangy individuals that dared to defy the lines of trespass. Fumigants as well as tear gas would have been appropriate equipage for the occasion.

To the half million men and boys who are performing their duty under Old Glory in Vietnam, the occasion was all the more deplorable. Thankfully, the loathsome derelicts who challenged the troops at the Pentagon are but a minute proportion of our youth, a vast majority of whom are ready to serve their country regardless of their personal views on our international policy.

As the forces of rebellious filth rendezvoused for their attack against lawful government on Saturday, readers of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat were becoming acquainted with one young man who accepted the billet assigned him by the Pentagon. Charles P. Savage, Jr., of Hastings, Pa., is the subject of an article by Gary W. Graham entitled "A Hero Though Not Old Enough To Drink or Vote."

After the deplorable experiences in Washington over the weekend, the story of the hero from Hastings is particularly welcome and refreshing reading. Charles Savage lost part of a leg in Vietnam, but he will always walk tall and straight in the admiring eyes of his fellow Americans.

There is still another hero in the Graham article. When this young man's brother recently received his preinduction notice, a brave and dedicated mother said:

I guess Richy will be next. We'd rather not have to go through with this again, but if Richy has to go, then he'll go.

God bless the Savage family. They reinforce a faith that no "beachnik" or "dippie" can ever destroy.

The article from the Tribune-Democrat follows:

A HERO THOUGH NOT OLD ENOUGH TO DRINK OR VOTE

(By Gary W. Graham)

HASTINGS, PA.—His GI buddies called him "the human mine sweeper" because he had been blown out of three trucks while mak-

ing supply runs to line outfits along the northeastern coast of South Vietnam.

Now, several months later—and minus the lower part of his right leg—he's back home. His civvies are a little baggy because of the weight he lost while in hospitals in South Vietnam, the Philippines, Japan and the States. He doesn't smoke anymore; he stopped a two-pack-a-day habit for some reason after a land mine explosion had hurled him out of his truck for the third time.

"Home feels nice," he says through a tight smile. "I guess I'm damn lucky to be here. But they say I'll have to learn to walk all over again. It'll probably be easier this time." That tight smile again.

ON CONVALESCENT LEAVE

Home is on Hastings R.D. 1, and glad to be there is Spec. 4 Charles P. Savage Jr., better known as Chuck. Chuck is on a 30-day convalescent leave from the Valley Forge Military Hospital. "That's where I have to go to get my new leg."

Chuck, the oldest of four children, was born in Spangler. His father, Charles Sr., is a woodsman, self-employed. His mother is a small woman who worries a lot about her boys, the three of them.

Chuck was graduated from Cambria Heights High School, Patton; got a job with a construction company in Barnesboro; then changed jobs, and began driving bulldozer for a Johnstown wrecking company. Then he was drafted.

MEMBER OF 31ST INFANTRY

Mid-February 1967 found Chuck a private first class and a member of the 196th Light Brigade, 4th Battalion, 31st Infantry.

The province of Tay Ninh, just north of Saigon, "looked just like something out of a comic book; the ox carts and rice fields and all that," Chuck recalled.

He then was transferred to a sand-bagged hole called Chu Lai, more than 500 miles north of Saigon. There, he was assigned as a truck driver.

Chuck's principal duty was to deliver supplies and water to perimeter positions and line companies. This almost-daily chore took him over the same dusty, bush-lined, one-lane road, with a gun Jeep as an escort and usually a buddy riding shotgun.

STRIKES BOOBYTRAP

On May 3 at 10 a.m., Chuck and his shotgun rider were traveling that dusty road when the 2½-ton truck struck a Viet Cong boobytrap—a 105mm howitzer artillery shell embedded nose-down in the road, and rigged with a pressure fuse detonator.

Chuck and his "shotgun" were blown out of the truck.

Although knocked unconscious, the two soldiers escaped serious injury. "We just got scratched up," Chuck said. The truck, No. 13 assigned to Headquarters & Headquarters Company, was a complete loss.

THE SECOND TIME

Eighteen days later, on another morning run, almost the exact thing happened. It was 11 o'clock, 200 yards from where the first mine had caught Chuck's truck. The occupants again were blown out of the truck, and escaped serious injury.

"After I got it the second time, my CO (commanding officer) must have pitied me, because he assigned me to work at the motor pool. But after two or three days I got bored and asked to start driving again.

"I had it pretty good for a while after that," Chuck said. "I didn't hit another mine for a couple of months."

ALONE IN TRUCK

On the morning of July 24 Chuck was driving his supply truck along that same red-dirt road. He was alone in the truck, but a Jeep armed with a recoilless rifle was up

front. The trip up to the outposts was uneventful; the trip back, not so.

"All I can remember is hearing an explosion and feeling the truck lift up. Then I felt myself being shot straight up, like out of a cannon. I musta blacked out, because the next thing I remembered is lying on the hood of my truck. I tried to jump down to run for cover. But when I hit the ground, I buckled. Both my ankles were broken, the right one real bad."

Chuck was evacuated to the Chu Lai aid station by helicopter. He later was taken to a hospital in the Philippines, then on to Japan.

It was in Japan that the Army doctors told Chuck they would have to amputate his lower right leg boot-high. "I figured it would be okay for them to cut it off," Chuck said, "because they said I probably would never be able to walk on it again."

"I remember," Chuck smiled, "we used to wave our stumps at the Japanese civilians when they walked by the hospital. Really shook 'em up."

Chuck is due to get out of the service next September, but he'll probably be discharged much sooner because of his injuries.

He says he feels great now, and hopes to be back driving a bulldozer again. He loves motorcycles, and has owned three at one time.

"I only have one bike now, and I'm going to get back on it as soon as I can. I'd like to run cycles in a few races; I really dig motorcycle racing."

The only way Chuck has changed mentally, he says, is that he has developed a fear of the number 13. All of the trucks that were blown out from beneath him were numbered 13.

"It's crazy, I guess, but I just don't like that number. Then again, I guess it isn't too bad. I didn't get killed."

Chuck's brother, Richard, is 19 and just got his pre-induction notice.

"I guess Richy will be next," said Mrs. Savage. "We'd rather not have to go through this again, but if Richy has to go, then he'll go."

Chuck's tour of duty in South Vietnam brought him the following awards: A Purple Heart for each time he got blown out of his truck, with a first and second Oak Leaf Cluster for the second and third times. He was awarded the Bronze Star by this country, and the Bronze Star with the Cross of Gallantry by the South Vietnamese government, the highest award given to servicemen of foreign nations by the South Vietnamese.

Also, Chuck's battalion commander has put him in for a Silver Star.

And he's not old enough to drink beer or to vote.

SBA, GUARDIAN OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, a complaint many of us frequently hear is that government is often far removed from the people, impersonal, bureaucratic, and so involved with theory that it seldom gets down to the level of practical affairs.

I must say that anyone who has long been in government must admit some truth to this charge.

But anyone who has had experience, either in business or government, knows well that bureaucracy and seeming lack

of concern for the individual, are an unfortunate function of bigness, rather than the result of malevolent design.

The truth is that big business, no less than big government, is constantly engaged in a battle to keep close to the needs and desires of the people.

One of the great advantages of small business is that the owner and proprietor is in his shop every day, meeting customers, hearing complaints, and making sure that the work his business performs comes up to his own high standards of excellence and is performed efficiently and without delay.

It is only natural that this advantage which the small businessman enjoys over his big competitor would have a parallel in government.

A small Government agency, decentralized in its operations, and with offices in many communities, is much more responsible to the people, and much more effective, than a large bureaucracy centered in Washington. In my own experience, I have seen the truth of this, time, and time again.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Urban Areas, I am well acquainted with the plight of urban small business.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in my own hometown of Chicago, which I think we could refer to as an urban area with a great many small business problems, I feel the SBA has done a splendid job in carrying out the functions assigned by the Congress.

Now it seems that we are going to have to fight, once more, a problem which I thought we had firmly settled once and for all. I refer to section 406 of title IV of the poverty bill passed by the Senate, and already reported by our own Committee on Education and Labor.

Two years ago there was a move afoot to transfer the independent SBA to the big-business-oriented Department of Commerce. At that time, a letter was sent to the President, signed by our distinguished chairman, Representative JOE L. EVINS, and by virtually the entire membership of the Select Committee on Small Business, including myself. It stated, in effect, that it was the intention of the signatories that SBA not be so subordinated. I believe there were also many sense-of-Congress resolutions introduced saying the same thing.

And now it appears that we must fight this same problem, Mr. Speaker. Section 406 of title IV, if passed into law, would accomplish, through a backdoor approach, that which it has not been possible to accomplish openly; namely, it would transfer to the Department of Commerce certain vital functions currently being carried out by SBA. I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand why this matter keeps cropping up, especially since the Congress expressly provided in section 4A of the SBA Act that the agency "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government." The way I see it, transferring SBA's functions to another agency would be about the same as transferring the agency itself.

And so that is why I raise my voice today in defense of a small Government

agency—very small as Federal Government establishments go—the Small Business Administration.

Here is an agency that is accustomed to getting things done. It has no cumbersome bureaucracy to strangle its effectiveness or dull its impact. It translates legislative demands and authorizations into action within a few hours.

In personal terms, what does this mean? It means that if we, the Members of the Congress, give the Small Business Administration the go-ahead signal on a certain program, the impact, the benefits, of this program will be felt by the man in the street almost immediately.

There is no lost motion, no cumbersome and expensive and delaying levels of expertise to be penetrated and placated and put in line.

The Small Business Administrator has but to give the order and in 73 offices in major cities throughout the Nation it will be carried into action.

These SBA offices have full authority to act on their own, in concert, to carry out a national objective, and they have sufficient leeway to fit the national objectives to the needs of the people whom they serve every day.

I cannot urge too strongly that we now act in the best interests of the people whom we serve by preserving, unimpaired, the effective authority that this agency, the Small Business Administration, now has.

In the words of our distinguished chairman, in his remarks of last week to the House of Representatives:

Let us not return to inefficiency and divided authority in the small business assistance program.

SERVICES OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I met with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Robert C. Moot, to conclude an agreement under which the SBA, at my request, will establish a new service for the people of Herkimer County, N.Y. Briefly, I wish to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues because it is my thought that others may wish to avail themselves of an opportunity to bring a Government service closer to the people they represent.

As one who has long supported and followed with interest the various assistance programs under the jurisdiction of the Small Business Administration, I have endeavored to cooperate fully with the SBA regional office in Syracuse, N.Y., in disseminating information to my constituents about this agency. Thanks to the splendid help of the director of the regional office, Mr. J. Wilson Harrison, and his very capable and hard-working staff, many struggling small business enterprises in my district have received the

guidance and financial aid required to continue and expand their operations.

Not all of those who have turned to SBA for assistance have had their requests approved; there are, of course, limitations on what can be done. However, I do know that the SBA representatives who service my area have been most courteous and helpful.

Many times I have personally arranged an appointment for one of my constituents to sit down with an SBA representative at Syracuse to discuss his needs and, if appropriate, to make application for assistance. Although this has worked out very well, there has been room for improvement. Particularly have I been concerned that a number of Herkimer County residents were finding it difficult to travel to Syracuse—sometimes as much as 200 miles round trip—just to inquire about a program. This was a problem, especially, for the individual operator without a staff to take care of things while he was away.

The solution to the problem became very simple because Mr. Moot and Mr. Harrison were responsive, and Mr. John Ladd, executive director of the Mohawk Valley Economic Development District, was willing to cooperate.

At my request, SBA, through a constructive and imaginative approach it designates "Outreach," will send, on the first Wednesday of each month, starting November 1, 1967, a representative from its Syracuse office to Herkimer County for the purpose of meeting and discussing with area residents the various SBA programs. Mr. Ladd's office in Mohawk, N.Y., will be the local SBA headquarters.

I am always glad to be able to play a part in bringing a Government service closer to the people, and I am confident that this new SBA venture in Herkimer County will benefit all concerned.

A BILL CONCERNING THE INSPECTION AND REGISTRATION OF DRUG MANUFACTURING FIRMS

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, there exists in this country today a flourishing business in black-market medicine—a business that is fast becoming rich supplying inferior and counterfeit drugs to persons sorely in need of proper medication.

How is this possible? It is possible mainly because our Food and Drug Administration does not have the staff and legal means to prevent it.

Recently, Miss Margaret Kreig appeared before the Legal and Monetary Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee. After more than 2 years of undercover work alongside agents of the FDA, she has written a book entitled "Black Market Medicine." In her book, Miss Kreig documents the many ways inferior and counterfeit drugs get onto

the shelves of nearly every pharmacy in the land. These inferior pharmaceuticals reach the shelves of our local drugstores mainly because the agency charged with administering this type of manufacturing does not have the legal means to prevent it. The only requirement for obtaining a drug manufacturing registration number is to merely apply for it. FDA is not empowered, at this time, to refuse a request for registry. Under the present procedure, it might be a year or more before FDA inspectors are able to personally visit this new "laboratory."

During this period, drugs by the millions could have been manufactured and sold legally with no real control over procedures and quality.

Consider the consumer who attempts to purchase a needed pharmaceutical. The label describes the contents and even bears a Federal registry number. The consumer, noting the apparent Government approval of the drug and its manufacturer, buys the item. That item may have come from one of the better drug firms, or it may well have come from one of the numerous illicit operators. How can the buyer be sure? He cannot. The only guide he has to go by is the Federal Government registration number; and, under present law, that Government registry number does not give him one bit of protection. The consumer is lulled into a false sense of security.

According to the U.S. Treasury records, there are 1,600 firms in the drug industry category, some with assets of up to \$250 million. There are 300 such firms with assets in excess of \$1 million. Nearly half their products are sold through 1,500 wholesale druggists and 900 jobbers. Drugs are legally sold, dispensed, or handled by more than 50,000 retail drugstores, 7,000 hospitals, 330,000 medical doctors and medical researchers, more than 100,000 dentists, 20,000 veterinarians, and a half-million professional nurses. This leaves a vast area of distribution that is almost impossible to police effectively.

A shocking disclosure was the fact that hoodlums and gangsters with long criminal records are operating a number of these pharmaceutical firms. An example of this type of operation is that of a man in a New York suburb who, when finally apprehended, was found to have more than a million dollars worth of inferior and counterfeit drugs hidden in a secret room carved out of the hillside adjacent to his garage. In this man's possession were punches stolen from a well-known drug manufacturer—punches that had been used to turn out countless millions of counterfeit drugs, drugs that may well have claimed the lives of numerous desperately ill patients whose very existence depended on properly compounded drugs.

And there are numerous other cases, all documented by the files of the Food and Drug Administration. If all the Nation's drug firms were required to not only register with the FDA before initiating the manufacturing of drugs, but to be subject to an onsite inspection before being granted a registration number, I believe the bulk of this illicit drug manu-

facturing would be forced into deserved bankruptcy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like, at this time, to introduce an amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act designed to offer protection to the consumer. This bill provides for an onsite inspection of all new pharmaceutical firms within 30 days of their filing for a Federal registry number.

Under this legislation, an application for registration could be denied if the firm: First, does not conform with current good manufacturing practices; second, fails to maintain adequate records and controls; and, third, does not operate in compliance with Federal, State, and local requirements.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of sustaining this registration and inspection system would be borne by funds received from registration fees.

I find it appalling that the production of dog and cat food is closely watched by Federal inspectors, while the production of drugs for human consumption is subject to such illicit acts as I have already noted. Why should we not assure similar protection to humans?

It is hoped that this action will go a long way toward providing our citizens with at least some measure of protection against those unscrupulous individuals who would prey on the ills of our citizens.

HONOLULU SOCIAL SECURITY EMPLOYEES COMMENDED BY CONGRESSMAN MATSUNAGA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, recently I became aware of an excellent example of the high quality of public service provided by some of our Federal employees. We hear too little about the many Federal employees who are doing a good job and quite a lot about the few who are doing a poor job. It is my desire, therefore, to inform my colleagues about what the employees of the Social Security district office in Honolulu have done to acquaint the residents of my State with their rights under the medicare program.

We all know how complicated these provisions are and the difficulty many older people have in understanding this law. In my State this problem is perhaps even more complicated than it is anywhere else in the country. Many of our residents do not have the proficiency in English that is needed to understand the pamphlets which are so useful on the mainland in explaining the program. In recognition of this peculiar situation, the manager of the office, Mr. Harold S. Burr, a long-time resident of the islands, active in civic affairs and a retired captain in the Naval Reserve, and the employees of the Honolulu district office prepared, printed, and distributed three pamphlets on medicare. These pamphlets explain in the languages—Chinese,

Japanese, and Ilocano—understood by many of the people of our Island State, the intricate mechanics of how the medicare benefits are paid and how much of the hospital and medical care benefits are covered. Mr. Burr and his staff have, on their own initiative, performed a necessary and valuable service for the people of Hawaii. As Hawaii's Representative to Congress I take this means of commending Mr. Burr and his associates.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE SUPPORTS THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967, S. 780

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee supports the Air Quality Act of 1967, S. 780. This bill would encourage the solution of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States. It would provide \$362.3 million over a 3-year period for air control research, studies, planning, and grants to States and air pollution agencies. Air pollution is no longer just a threat—it is a present menace to the health and well-being of the American people. Under this legislation, reasonable standards can be established and the States and regions will be empowered to develop plans and programs to combat and reduce air pollution.

Approximately 130 million tons of pollutants are discharged annually into the Nation's atmosphere, an average of 1,400 pounds for each American. This pollution is a byproduct of our highly developed economy. It stems from the rising number of motor vehicles, and from the trend toward urbanization which concentrates the highest levels of pollution in the most populated areas. Economic and mechanical progress has meant the deterioration of our precious air supply. Smog, damage to health and property, and even death have resulted from the pollution of our air.

Steps must be taken to improve this Nation's knowledge of and technical capability to meet the air pollution problem. In his 1955 state of the Union address, President Eisenhower urged the enactment of air pollution legislation. With the support of Republicans of both Houses of Congress, the first legislation in this field was enacted by the 84th Congress. S. 780 would materially strengthen and improve this basic legislation. We urge its adoption.

"TERRORIST INCURSIONS FROM ZAMBIA": STATEMENTS FROM RHODESIA

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his re-

marks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of Members a statement by the Prime Minister of Rhodesia, the Honorable Ian Smith, recounting terrorist activities against this nation and communication of this information on this activity to an uninterested British Government.

Value lies not only in the comments on terror against Rhodesia—terror which certainly appears to be backed and directed by Communist forces which are ever ready to take advantage of such folly as U.S. and U.N. sanctions—but also indications that Rhodesians, black and white, are united against intrusions from without.

Included with the Prime Minister's remarks are those of other Members of the Rhodesian Parliament. For the sake of showing the unity, I point out that three of the Members who spoke following the Prime Minister are African Members. I think one particular statement by one of these Members, Mr. Rubatika, is worth emphasis. He states:

As far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

We, as outsiders, would do well to listen to this statement and heed.

Also included is the note to which Mr. Smith refers, which was conveyed to the British Government concerning terrorist campaigns.

The statements are as follows:

TERRORIST INCURSIONS FROM ZAMBIA

(Statement by the Prime Minister, the Honorable I. D. Smith, and other proceedings of the Rhodesian Parliament, Aug. 30, 1967)

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE RHODESIAN PARLIAMENT

With the leave of the House, I wish to make a statement. I lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Note* of 28th August, 1967, which the Rhodesia Government handed to the British Government yesterday in London drawing to the attention of the British Government the recent spate of terrorist incursions into Rhodesia, pointing out to them the encouragement and assistance given to these terrorists by the Zambian Government and, more important, emphasizing the fact that the British Government cannot escape its share of responsibility for these developments.

The British Government has rejected this Note. The head of the Rhodesian Residual Mission in London was informed that the Commonwealth Office had examined the document and had declared that it could not be accepted because Her Majesty's Government do not recognize the Rhodesian Government and cannot therefore accept any diplomatic Note emanating from them in that capacity.

I think this action by the British Government clearly expresses their disregard for the well-being of Rhodesia, in spite of their protests that they are opposed to violence and disorder. This attitude is in strange contrast to the military and police support which Rhodesia and Rhodesian forces have willingly given to the Commonwealth in the past.

*See Appendix to this article.

I will not deal with the period of the last great war—the part played by Rhodesia throughout this epic struggle is too well known to warrant repetition.

Confining myself to the post-war era, let me remind Britain that in 1951 Rhodesia provided two fighter squadrons as a contribution to Commonwealth defense. For a further post-war period Rhodesia became the home of a Royal Air Force training group and the Rhodesian Government contributed towards its upkeep. From 1958 to 1963, on nine different occasions, Rhodesian Vampire and Canberra squadrons were detached to Aden and Cyprus respectively and while there were under British command. In 1961 Rhodesian transport aircraft provided notable assistance to the Royal Air Force during the Kuwait crisis when Royal Rhodesian Air Force Canberras transported British troops in the Middle East. Later in the same year Rhodesian Dakotas transported and dropped food to flood-stricken tribesmen in Somalia at the request of the British Government.

As for the Rhodesian Army: in late 1950 a squadron of 100 European volunteers with regular officers and non-commissioned officers was raised as part of the Rhodesian contribution to Commonwealth defense and went to Malaya to fight communist terrorists—the very type of trained men who are attempting to infiltrate Rhodesia today. The squadron served in Malaya from April, 1951, to March, 1953, where it operated as a separate entity—"C" Squadron of the 22nd Special Air Service Regiment. In July, 1962, the present "C" Squadron of the Special Air Service went to Aden for training and operated against terrorists and, again, as part of the 22nd Special Air Service Regiment. Today this same unit is in our front lines operating against the infiltrating communist terrorists.

In 1952 the First Battalion of the Rhodesian African Rifles served in the Suez Canal zone in the Middle East. This was followed by a tour of duty in Malaya from April, 1956, to February, 1958, fighting communist terrorists.

The British South Africa Police have given extensive postwar assistance to the British Government in Bechuanaland, Nyasaland, Kenya and Northern Rhodesia as they were then known, four different contingents varying from one officer and 75 members to two officers and 118 men were made available to Bechuanaland in 1950, 1951 and 1952. A large contingent of officers and members was sent to Nyasaland in 1953. Two officers and 52 men were lent to Northern Rhodesia in September/October, 1956. Northern Rhodesia, as it was then, Zambia as it is known today, I remind hon. members, is the country which is aiding and abetting the present terrorist incursion into Rhodesia. Finally, three officers and 250 members were sent to the assistance of British authorities in Nyasaland from February to March, 1959.

In January, 1965, I personally made representations to the British Prime Minister about the training of saboteurs and the harbouring of terrorists in Zambia and Tanzania. The British Prime Minister was unable to give me an entirely satisfactory reply. He took the opportunity of talking about the matter with the Zambian President and accepted the latter's denial that they were allowing Zambia to become a springboard for activities against Rhodesia. President Kaunda said that although his Government could not refuse entry to other Africans, they were exercising careful control over those claiming to be refugees and that they had put restrictions on the activities of political groups. In the light of present day events the value of such assurances can be seen for what they are—a hollow and deceitful mockery of the truth.

In June, 1965, I followed this up by sending Mr. Wilson a full account of the activities and training of Rhodesian subversive elements in Tanzania and Ghana and again the

reply we received was unsatisfactory; Mr. Wilson saying that he would study carefully the information which the Rhodesian authorities had made available to him through his intelligence channels.

However, this latest case, which I have drawn to your attention today, is the most blatant example of Britain assisting and indeed encouraging the actions of terrorists against friendly countries. I do not wish to exaggerate the present encounter for there is no doubt that our security forces are managing to deal with the terrorist invaders in a most adequate manner, but it is a fact that there has been a resurgence of terrorist activity recently, and most of these people have been effectively indoctrinated with Chinese communism and are dedicated to committing the most atrocious acts of terrorism. Moreover, I think it should be placed on record that the great majority of this gang are members of the South African African National Congress, hoping to pass through Rhodesia in order to practice their deadly trade south of the Limpopo. All Governments, including the British Government, must be aware of a joint press release issued in Lusaka on the 19th of this month signed by the Deputy Presidents of the Zimbabwe African People's Union, a Rhodesian organization, and the South African African National Congress, a South African organization, in which they declared that "the fighting presently going on in the Wankie area is indeed being carried out by a combined force of the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the South African African National Congress which is marching on a common route, each bound to its destination, fighting the common settlers enemy to the finish."

On previous occasions when I have taken up the case of the British Government condoning and even supporting the infiltration of terrorists from Zambia, Mr. Wilson did at least reply, although evading the issue. But in this particular case his answer is that he cannot even consider my representations because they come from an illegal Government. Putting it in a nutshell, Mr. Wilson is prepared to deal with me and indeed meet me and talk to me, when it suits him personally and when he hopes to extricate himself from the hook of sanctions on which he is so firmly entangled, but when the lives of poor, decent, innocent people are involved, both black and white, Mr. Wilson has the nerve to say that he cannot accept my communication, because it comes from an illegal Government. This must take the "Oscar" for the greatest piece of hypocrisy of all time. I repeat, that when he thought I might be able to assist him to extricate his head from the sanctions noose, he was prepared, not only to receive a communication from me, but to dine and wine me on board one of his battle-ships.

This story will surely fill a memorable, but nevertheless shameful page in the history of the present British Labour Party Government and if by chance some unfortunate mishap should befall any innocent Rhodesian, or, for that matter, any inhabitant of Africa south of the Zambezi, then we all know upon whose shoulders a large portion of this blame will fall.

SPEECHES BY MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITION AND OTHER MEMBERS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BEHANE. I wish to comment on certain activities taking place in my part of the country. I am making this comment due to the fact that the Prime Minister made a statement to this House this afternoon concerning the same matters.

I must say that sitting in this House, I represent the people of Matabeleland North, which is the area within which western Matabeleland falls. I cannot but say that I have the interests of those people at heart, and I would be failing in my duty as a mem-

ber in Parliament representing that area if I did not comment on the matters that are taking place in that part of the country.

It is very well known to this House, and indeed to the country at large, that I have always stood firmly against terrorism and that I always do. I believe that what is being done by our Forces in that part of the country is worth all the praise that this House can give. Apart from the security of the whole country these dedicated men are fighting to preserve peace among the people living in western Matabeleland, people who do not take any interest in what is happening; in fact they do not know what communism is and they do not even know what these infiltrators are trying to bring about. So, for the security of the country and in particular for the security of the people in that part of the country where these minor skirmishes are taking place at this moment, I believe our Forces are worthy of the praise that can emanate from this House. Not only so; reading in the papers we find that several members of our Forces and of the Police Force have lost their lives. They have done that in the belief that Rhodesia is a country whose standards are worthy of being preserved, a country where I still believe there is a chance for all the races to come together and settle their differences.

I will never accept any foreign doctrines as a substitute for our doctrines here. I will never believe that Russian communism or communist Chinese are the people who have the solutions for our problems in this country. If I did believe in that I would just as well believe that there is peace in the Congo to-day and that these forces have been able to resolve or bring about peace in the countries that have been destroyed to their lowest stage of economy where people have no peace.—[Mr. Majongwe: And thousands of lives lost.]—I have sometimes said that these terrorists outside the country have done nothing to bring about peace, or indeed to improve the lot of the African in his country. All they have done is they have brought despondency. If they were really interested in the welfare of this country I challenge the hon. gentleman who signed this document as attached to come down to Rhodesia themselves and do the fighting themselves. If they do not want to expose their skills to the bullets of our Forces then they at least should come down and solve issues in Rhodesia because our issues, I believe, will have to be solved in Rhodesia or never at all.

I have said the welfare of these people in western Matabeleland is in danger and it is our Forces who are gallantly trying to preserve peace in that part of the country. I may, in short, try and bring before this House the aims of these infiltrators. First of all, I would like to know where they have had the training, where they have had the arms and the ammunition—from people who would like to see this country destroyed. It is from people who would like to impose a worse type of government in this country, a worse type of persecution of the lower races by their own members because they have not got enough room in their own countries and they would like to find room in Rhodesia.—[Mr. Chigogo: In Africa as a whole.]—I say again praise to our Forces who are trying to preserve law and order, who are fighting, who are losing their lives and who are facing difficulties to try and maintain law and order in this country.

I speak as a family man; I have love for my family; I believe it is the same with every one of us here and apart from anything else I would love to see my children grow up happily and because I am involved in politics is no reason why my family should suffer from injustices. I believe indeed that if it is a sin that I am a politician then those sins must grossly come upon me and never upon my children because I made my choice and

I will let my children grow up and make their choices. I believe it is the duty of everyone, every citizen of Rhodesia at this time when we are faced with foreign doctrines, to stand together, to forget politics and to strive never to bring politics into matters of national importance. I believe it is the duty of every citizen in this country to fight to preserve peace. It is the duty of every citizen to take up arms and defend this country from foreign infiltrators, indeed to defend this country from communism. I believe that our Forces at this moment need both moral and physical support, and this is one institution where such feelings should be voiced.

In conclusion, I would like to confirm and redirect the words of the reverend gentleman, the Dean of Bulawayo, who said that terrorism is lawless and must be condemned by all sections of this country, by all spheres, because it knows no law. We know that when these people have had the chance of infiltrating into this country they have killed at random people they had nothing against. They have killed for the sake of killing, for the sake of demonstrating that they can kill, and they have robbed not people like myself who can defend themselves but they have robbed elderly poor people, say, in the Mrewa District, elderly poor people who cannot defend themselves, and they have forced them to give them money. Why should such actions be condoned? Why should that be mistaken for politics? I believe that is not politics, it is only because a few people who are keeping themselves very safe in another country are satisfied to send their own brothers to come and die here in order that they may enjoy the fruits of life wherever they are.—[Mr. Majongwe: They will not enjoy them for long.]

Mr. RUBATIKA. It is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to comment on this motion on the adjournment. In fact, I am bewildered at times when I see men holding responsible positions paying lip service to the principle of the maintenance of law and order in this country. When it is to their convenience they uphold law and order but when it is not to their convenience they do not uphold law and order. I have seen men some time ago who have gone almost weeping to the Minister of Law and Order asking for protection, but today those are the people who are giving the Minister of Law and Order a hard time because he has brought tranquillity to this country. They have one foot among the terrorists and another foot among the decent people for fear that should the terrorists win they will be accepted as having championed their cause.

Today there are some who are being intimidated because of these people. I am surprised that some of these people are still moving around and yet some of them are being paid by Government in certain institutions of Government. Wherever we move we are told that we are the people who support—I am sorry to use unparliamentary language—"I support Smith and Lardner-Burke". We have plainly told them that as far as we are concerned we might have differences, as members of a family, but we are one in the maintenance of law and order, we are one as a nation of Rhodesia.

I must register my strongest protest to Britain for lack of foresight. Let us say that these terrorists were given the Migs to land in Zambia and the communists bombed our territory, what does Britain think would happen? The Rhodesian Air Force would start bombing the bases from which those Migs came. Would this not escalate? We expect Britain, since it says it has responsibility over us up to date, to act as the Prime Minister stated, by exercising his influence on Zambia to stop terrorism and at least to register a protest on behalf of the African people whom it is stating it is championing. We do not want any loss of blood.

As far as my electoral district is con-

cerned and all the electoral districts, all of us hate the chaos and disorder which happened some time ago. We stand in admiration of Government's stand on bringing about law and order. If by any eventuality the white man should fall we must pay the price and I am prepared to tell them to shoot me because I am dedicated to a cause and I shall live and die by it.

Mr. CHIGOGO. I must heartily thank the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) whose electoral district adjoins mine and, as he has said, these troubles are really taking place in his electoral district and equally the same in the Gokwe area. All I have to say here is not much, because a multitude of words is not going to help us at all. I will ask the Prime Minister to ask the Prime Minister of Great Britain whether this is a trick by which Britain would like to arm itself against Rhodesia to say people are fighting and there is chaos. If not, could the Prime Minister of Great Britain tell us where these people are being trained, whether he has any alliances with those training camps where the Rhodesian people are being trained to come and disturb the lives of the innocent Tribal Trust Land people and the innocent farmers who are feeding the 4,000,000 Africans and the 200,000 Europeans in this country?

These are the only questions I would like the Prime Minister to convey to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Let us know if he is doing any good to those crying for freedom as such, whether the situation that he has been experiencing not only in the Congo, but in Nigeria, Tanzania and Ghana. One needs to mention all of these. Is that what Britain would like to see? May I know again through our Prime Minister whether Great Britain is going to honour Ghana and Nigeria to sit on the Prime Minister's Conference? Those people not only took their freedom but killed their own Prime Ministers; for what reason? I would like to know these answers if the Prime Minister would convey them.

Mr. NEWINGTON. As a back-bencher, may I say how grateful we are on this side of the House to see honest courageous and determined men opposite, men who have the same purpose at heart as we do on this side of the House, and that is the safety and security of Rhodesia. I would like to give them my wholehearted congratulations and my appreciation for their courage. I feel though, at the same time, the finger should be placed firmly and fairly on the guilty and evil men.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) on bringing this matter up and the other members who have joined in this small debate on the adjournment. It is indeed very refreshing to find that in times of national emergency when we are challenged as a country, that we can have people on both sides of the House taking the stand that we have, over the last 20 minutes, witnessed.

I believe that this attitude that has been portrayed here this evening is the attitude which goes throughout the length and breadth of this country. This is, in the main, the feeling of the broad mass of Rhodesians. There are exceptions of course, as there are exceptions in this House, Mr. Speaker, and this was quite evident earlier this afternoon but I am pleased to say that this is confined to a few people. I believe the majority concur with the views that have been expressed here.

How right it was to point out, Sir, what good have these people done to anybody in Rhodesia when they have come here killing people indiscriminately, black and white. Who can they claim to be assisting? The hon. member for Matabeleland North (Mr. Behane) put his finger very firmly on the spot when he said these are agents of communism, and I believe particularly the yellow communist, and that they would love to have this country for themselves. If they

did ever get to this stage, then, Mr. Speaker, God help all Rhodesians, not one section or another section. I go along all the way with him and the other hon. members who supported him when they said that whatever problems we have in Rhodesia can only be solved by Rhodesians. This should be a golden rule.

I have no idea what Mr. Willson is after. I am sorry, I cannot make a constructive reply to the question put to me by the hon. member for Gokwe (Mr. Chigogo).

I have tried to get him to face up to his responsibilities on a number of occasions and he has failed to do so. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by going on flogging a dead horse. Let us make up our minds that we here have got to produce the right solution for Rhodesia. Let us enjoy the system of democracy whereby we can argue and criticize one another; this is healthy. Opposition is part and parcel of our Government and we must have it. But when it comes to infiltration of people from outside bringing in outside views and outside doctrines, this will only be to the detriment of everybody in Rhodesia because Rhodesia will be divided and people from outside, Mr. Speaker, I believe will ultimately come in and win the day and reap the benefits. There is room for all of us in Rhodesia, in this wonderful country which is the envy of so many other parts of the world. They are green with envy and this is why I believe so many of them are waging the war against us; they would love to have what we have.

So, as long as we can keep together and as long as we can have the sort of constructive debates which we have seen in this short adjournment, then I believe they will never succeed. I once again would like to compliment the responsible hon. members of the Opposition benches for their contribution.—[Hon. members: Hear, hear.]

APPENDIX

NOTE TO THE UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT FROM THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 28, 1967

1. The Rhodesia Government wishes to draw urgently to the attention of the British Government the following situation in Rhodesia.

2. Leaders of the two banned Rhodesian African Nationalist Organizations, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) are now firmly established in Zambia and it is from Lusaka that these people plan subversive operations directed against the Government of Rhodesia, including the infiltration of armed terrorists and offensive materials into this country.

3. At one time the President of Zambia, through his security forces, tried to control the movement of terrorists and offensive materials through his country. From about the middle of 1966, however, when Rhodesian terrorist activities commenced to increase, all vestige of control appears to have vanished and the Zambian Government has since progressed from a policy of ignoring or condoning such activities to one of offering direct encouragement.

4. Rhodesian terrorists receive training in a number of communist countries, including Russia, Red China, Cuba and Algeria, and also at three or more camps in Tanzania. Irrespective of their place of training, terrorists invariably move from Tanzania to Zambia where they are billeted in specially constructed holding camps, established in the vicinity of Lusaka and within easy striking distance of Rhodesia.

5. In Zambia there are also a number of centres used by subversive organizations for the storage of arms, ammunition and other offensive materials used in the equipping of terrorist groups. At their respective holding camps ZAPU and ZANU Party officials inco-

ordinate the terrorists in Communist and Party Ideology, particularly in the context of the part they are to play in creating a sense of fear and uncertainty in Rhodesia.

6. Groups for terrorist incursions into Rhodesia are issued with arms and equipment and conveyed, quite openly, in ZAPU or ZANU vehicles along one or other of the Zambian road complexes to the Rhodesian border, where they are finally instructed on methods of infiltration and briefed on their targets in Rhodesia. During the hours of darkness they are expected to infiltrate across the Zambezi River into this country.

7. Not only does the Zambian Government condone the activities of Rhodesian terrorists in that country, but it is known that on occasions Zambian Government officials actually assist these people in passing through the border between Zambia and Tanzania.

8. The main supplier of arms and other offensive materials used by Rhodesian terrorists is the African Liberation Committee (A.L.C.) of the Organization of African Unity (O.A.U.) in Dar es Salaam. Here the material is received from a number of Communist countries and is stored by the Tanzanian Government, which is responsible for the control and subsequent issue of this material to various Nationalist movements.

9. Although there is no proof of direct co-operation between the Governments of Tanzania and Zambia in respect of the movement of offensive material, it is known that the former Government has already suggested to the latter that it adopts some method of control. It is extremely unlikely that the Zambian Government is ignorant of the movement and storage of terrorist arms in Zambia.

10. Since terrorist activity against Rhodesia was intensified about the middle of last year, an ever-increasing number of armed men, of both the ZAPU and ZANU factions, have been infiltrated into this country from Zambia. Initially, only small groups of terrorists entered across the Zambezi River from Zambia. In recent months larger bands—comprising up to thirty or more terrorists—have crossed into Rhodesia. Little credence can therefore be given to any denial by the Zambian Government that it is unaware of the movement of such large numbers of men and quantities of material.

11. The current security operation being waged against the large band of mixed South African African National Congress (SAANC) and ZAPU terrorists in Western Matabeleland shows without any doubt the Zambian authorities are not only prepared to condone terrorist activities directed against Rhodesia, but are also willing to allow their country to be used as a rallying point for terrorists bent on a campaign of violence against South Africa.

12. The recent threat issued by the Organization of African Unity to Rhodesian nationalists that they can expect no further financial support unless they can produce proof of militant action against Rhodesia has had a two-fold effect. It has influenced both ZAPU and ZANU to intensify the infiltration of terrorists from Zambia across the Zambezi River, and has stimulated ZAPU to abduct over two hundred Rhodesian Africans, in legitimate employment in Zambia, for terrorist training in Tanzania. Thus the Zambian Government has become further implicated by permitting these activities with little or no intervention.

13. On the 19th August in Lusaka, James Robert Chikerema, Vice President of ZAPU, and Oliver Tambo, Deputy President of the SAANC, issued a joint Press release extolling the activities of their combined terrorist groups presently operating in Western Matabeleland.

14. The aim of these terrorist bands is to carry out indiscriminate killing, burning and looting in rural and urban areas. The Rhodesian Government will adopt the most

vigorous measures to protect the people and their property and to seek out and destroy these terrorist bands and individual gunmen.

15. The British Government cannot escape its share of responsibility for these developments. There has been a complete absence of any protest by the British Government to the Zambian Government about the passage of arms and offensive material, the reception and harbouring of communist trained terrorists and the use of Zambia as a base for offensive operations against Rhodesia.

16. Here is a case where a Government of one Commonwealth country is lending itself to a policy of violence against another Commonwealth country which has committed no aggression and desires to be friendly and co-operative. The Rhodesian Government considers that Britain continues to have obligations in Zambia to influence that Government towards a policy of moderation and the discouragement of violence against Rhodesia. The Rhodesia Government accordingly lodges a strong protest against the British Government's lack of action in this respect and against its connivance of the hostile attitude of the Zambian Government towards peace and good government in Rhodesia.

EATING YOUR HEAD OFF

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Welfare Department is finding itself in quite a predicament. It seems that people are literally and figuratively taking advantage of it and the services it provides. All is said to be legal, but the welfare department is also said to be headed for bankruptcy at the hands of welfare recipients who are planning just that.

I will include for the RECORD a news item, first of a series, published in the New York Daily News, explaining how a "small but determined army of welfare recipients" are attempting to kill welfare with the end in mind of substituting a guaranteed annual wage.

And, as if most welfare and poverty programs were not in bad enough shape, there are attempts to make them worse. This is the face of congressional action from various quarters to improve existing programs.

The Daily News did contain a paragraph which I believe sums up a gigantic flaw in these long-range plans. It is:

This increased cost, officials argue, will surely harden John Q. Public's attitudes against present liberal welfare policies. With an antiwelfare public, chances would be nil for enactment of such a super-liberal program as a guaranteed annual income, the officials say.

It all reminds me of an advertisement paid for by the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland. The ad appeared in July 1956, but is still thought provoking. Here it is:

THERE IS SUCH A THING AS "EATING YOUR HEAD OFF"

Once upon a time, there was a cow who thought. (Not very well, but she thought.)

And she thought her farmer was making

too much profit on her milk. He provided a comfortable barn and stall, and hay and grain, but she wanted more.

So one day she held back her milk. Painful, but she was determined to have her rights. The farmer, in desperation, tried throwing in some more hay and grain, and she gave her milk again. No more milk, to pay for the added feed—just the same amount . . . where the money came from to pay for the added feed was the farmer's worry.

She liked this taste of power, so pretty soon went on strike again. And the farmer, in desperation, increased her feed.

Still no increase in the milk.

The farmer needed some roof repairs on the barn and new milk pails, but practically every cent he got for milk was now going into feed.

Power was now so pleasant to the cow that she went on strike at regular intervals. If she could have thought of some fringe benefits in addition to the greater pay, she would have demanded them, too.

Finally the milk wouldn't pay the feed bills. So the cow became hamburger, and the farmer, discouraged by cows who think but don't think straight, went into another business.

The New York Daily News article follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 25, 1967]

RELIEF ON THE ROCKS?—GROUP'S GOAL: KILL WELFARE FOR GUARANTEED PAY

(By Michael Clendenin and Donald Singleton)

A small but determined army of welfare recipients has opened a campaign designed to bankrupt, confuse and destroy the New York Welfare Department by overloading the city's relief rolls and overdrawing its bank account. Worried city and state officials say that this group has won the opening skirmishes and is dangerously close to all-out victory.

The army marches under the banner of the Poverty/Rights Action Program, a nationwide amalgam of local and state welfare "client" groups fighting for adoption of a federal guaranteed annual income law. They figure that the best way to develop public pressure for this is to make a shambles out of present welfare programs—to prove they don't work.

In recent months, this national army has aimed its heaviest artillery at its biggest, richest target—New York City, which has a coast-to-coast reputation for having the most liberal welfare programs in the country.

With the opening shots spent, the city is reeling under these statistics:

Relief rolls are leaping upward in recent months at the unprecedented rate of 29.8% per year, compared with a normal increase of between 11% and 15%. In August, 1966, 572,251 persons were on relief. Last August, the number had jumped to 742,953.

Costs are skyrocketing at an even faster pace and have been estimated at nearly 40% above last year. In August, 1966, \$33 million was handed out in public assistance. Last August, \$45.7 million was given out, up 37.2% in a single year.

A special study prepared by the Teamsters Union has predicted that the city's welfare budget will jump from \$913 million in 1967-68 to "at least \$1.5 billion" in the next fiscal year.

The legal staffs of the state and city welfare departments are bogged down under an avalanche of appeals aimed at increasing the amounts of relievers' semi-monthly checks. Last year, officials conducted an average of five such appeals, called "fair hearings," per month; right now, the hearing schedule is 50 a day, and still the backlog is growing.

Welfare officials are the first to admit that

there are many things wrong with even the best welfare programs—that the victims of poverty often have many legitimate grievances.

Their objection to the welfare rights movement is that it seems bent on tearing the programs apart without really providing practical alternatives. In their view, the real losers will be the very welfare recipients who are supposed to be helped.

HANDBOOK SPECIFIES STANDARD OF ASSISTANCE

Ironically, the welfare action leaders are using as their chief weapons the very sections of the welfare law which have been designed to solve some of the core problems of welfare.

Relief recipients are, under state law, entitled to be brought "up to standard" when they are accepted as welfare cases.

This means that each welfare recipient deserves to have specified amounts and kinds of clothing, furniture and other items, all of them carefully specified and catalogued in a 3-inch-thick Welfare Department document called "Handbook for Case Units in Public Assistance."

In the past, only welfare caseworkers knew the deep mysteries of the handbook. But the client groups put their experts to reading the book and it was discovered that only about 2% of all welfare recipients were completely at standard levels.

This fact has resulted in the "tea-strainer-potato-masher" approach. Such items as tea strainers, potato mashers and fruit reamers are listed in the book of standards, and client groups have set out to make sure that every reliever has one of each, whether he needs it or not.

The results can be viewed in dollar signs. In June 1965, for example, special clothing grants to bring recipients up to standard totaled \$540,131. Grants for household furnishings totaled \$671,179.

Last June, as the result of the recipients' groups campaign were beginning to be felt, clothing grants totaled \$1,272,678, a two-year increase of 75%. The grants for furnishings totaled \$1,893,179, a two-year hike of 103%.

FIFTY PERCENT OF WELFARE ELIGIBLES NEVER APPLY

In the area of the already bulging caseload, even Welfare Commissioner Mitchell I. Ginsberg has reported that for every person now on welfare in New York City, there probably is one other person who is eligible to receive assistance but who never has applied for help because he is unaware of his eligibility.

However, the Welfare Department doesn't hunt for welfare recipients and the client organizations make it one of their biggest functions. "I am sure that these client groups have been responsible for a significant portion of this increased caseload," Ginsberg said.

In the matter of fair hearings for clients, the law was designed to protect welfare recipients from being cheated by the system—a system which was designed to lean in the recipients' favor.

Early this month, one attorney associated with the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law said that legal applications for fair hearings in the previous two weeks alone had resulted in \$300,000 in extra funds paid to welfare cases.

"I can't be sure of the total figure," said the lawyer, David Gilman, "but I do know that by Sept. 25, more than \$150,000 had been paid out to clients in Brooklyn alone."

LOGIC OF THE CAMPAIGN IS QUESTIONED

All perfectly legal, both sides agree. But welfare officials have questioned the logic of the groups' frontal attack on the New York system, the most generous in the nation. The attack, officials believe, is almost

certain to drive the cost of the welfare program through the ceiling.

This increased cost, officials argue, will surely harden John Q. Public's attitudes against present liberal welfare policies. With an anti-welfare public, chances would be nil for enactment of such a super-liberal program as a guaranteed annual income, the officials say.

Under a guaranteed annual income, each needy person who had no income would receive a "paycheck" from Uncle Sam. And nobody would tell the "recipient" how to spend the money. Those who earned some money, but less than the guaranteed minimum, would be partially subsidized by the government.

"If these groups really are out to get relief recipients the things they deserve, if that is their real purpose, then they are performing a good," Ginsberg said. "It's not for me to question their motives anyway. The law tells me what I must do."

Asked if he thinks the state's law is a good one, Ginsberg said "yes." But he did admit "it undoubtedly is too complicated."

The leaders of the welfare rights movement, however, provide better clues to the purposes of their organizations.

CAMPAIGN LAUNCHED BY CHEMISTRY PROFESSOR

The man who originated the welfare rights program nearly two years ago is George Alvin Wiley, 37, a tall-soft-spoken organic chemistry professor at Syracuse University.

Wiley, who interrupted his teaching in 1964 to serve one year as associate national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, is director of the Poverty/Rights Action Center in Washington.

Wiley, who believes the welfare movement is "the most important development among low-income people since Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of a bus in Montgomery," prefers not to engage in tough talk. But he says his organization is willing to act tough.

"There is no substitute for organized political power," he said. "That's the only kind of power this system understands."

Wiley said the guaranteed annual income is the only way to wipe out poverty in America. "You ought to give more money to poor people—certainly at least the \$4,000 a year which the federal government calls the poverty line. And you ought to put a lot less strings on the money, too."

ATTACK IS LED BY SOCIAL WORK PROFESSOR

The man who is described as "the brains of the whole movement," however, is not so reticent as Wiley.

He is Richard A. Cloward, a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work, who first called for loading the welfare rolls in the summer of 1966, when he said:

"Widespread campaigns to register the eligible poor for welfare aid, aid to help existing recipients to obtain their full benefits, would produce bureaucratic disruption in welfare agencies and fiscal disruption in local and state governments.

"These disruptions would generate severe political strains and deepen existing divisions among elements in the big-city coalition: the remaining white middle class, the white working class ethnic groups and the growing minority poor."

Such a division, Cloward concludes, would force elected officials in Washington to "advance a federal solution" to the problem.

This "federal solution," he believes, would be the guaranteed annual income program.

In his more recent statements, Cloward leaves even less to the imagination:

"Recipients want to bring the welfare system to its knees, here and now," he said in an article he co-authored with Mrs. Frances Fox Piven, also a professor at the Columbia School of Social Work, in a recent issue of "The Nation" magazine.

"Campaigns to get benefits will produce perverse and persistent turmoil," the arti-

cle continued, "bureaucratic turmoil because cumbersome (and unconstitutional) procedures for review and surveillance will break down; fiscal turmoil, as welfare costs rise in localities where existing sources of tax revenue are already overburdened; and political turmoil . . ."

How does all of this affect the individual on welfare, and how does it affect the case-worker in the field?

AHEPA URGES CONTINUED AID TO GREECE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a number of well-meaning people are deeply concerned over the present government in Greece, and sincere differences of opinion exist over the situation in that country. In particular, some persons, including 52 Members of this body, have questioned the advisability of continuing economic and military aid to Greece.

The Order of AHEPA—American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—which has for the past 45 years expressed the thinking of most Americans of Greek descent, recently issued a statement urging the United States to continue its military and economic aid to Greece. The Supreme President of the Order of AHEPA, Andrew Fasseas, makes the following cogent observation in his statement:

If a European came to the United States and told the American people what type of government we should have, or whom to elect as our President, we would rightfully reject it as an unwarranted interference with our internal politics.

Rather, our chief concern should be whether the Government of Greece will meet all of its responsibilities to our NATO defense structure. The growing Soviet foothold in the Arab world heightens the strategic location of Greece as our ally in the struggle to resist communism. The AHEPA statement correctly points out that continuation of our aid to Greece is in the best interest of the United States, Greece, and the free world.

I place the AHEPA statement urging continued aid to Greece in the RECORD at this point:

AHEPA URGES UNITED STATES CONTINUE MILITARY AND ECONOMIC AID AND ASSISTANCE TO GREECE

CHICAGO, ILL.—Andrew Fasseas of Chicago, Ill., Supreme President of the Order of Ahepa (American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association) today issued the following statement:

"The Order of AHEPA is composed, in great part, of Americans of Greek descent. It is non-sectarian in religion and non-partisan in politics.

"Ahepa's members are proud and happy that our country and Greece always have been allies and friends. As an historic fact, there were many Americans, including Samuel Gridley Howe, George Jarvis, and many others who fought in the Greek War of Independence of 1821. The United States, by

Presidential action and Congressional Resolution, wholeheartedly supported the people of Greece in that great struggle.

"During World War I, the United States and Greece fought side by side.

"In World War II, Greece was again a valued and fruitful ally of our country. In that war its small but brave little army won the first victories against the Axis powers.

"After World War II, while other peoples and nations were busy rebuilding and recovering from war's devastation, the Greek people were called upon to fight yet another enemy—Communism.

"With American help, under the great Truman Doctrine, the people of Greece were the first nation that stopped the communist aggression. It is noteworthy that not a single American soldier shed his blood or lost his life in that great struggle of the Greek people.

"Since World War II, Greece has been a faithful ally of the United States. She is a valued and loyal member of NATO. Greece supplies the bases in the Middle East for the United States 6th Fleet and other American forces required in that part of the world in order to contain Communism.

"The best interests of our country require that Greece become and remain economically sound, and militarily strong.

"In the recent Israel-Arab war, Turkey, the other leg of the eastern anchor of NATO, declared that she would not allow the United States to use the NATO bases in Turkey. That left Greece as the only base of the United States in the Eastern Mediterranean. That proved once more that Greece is, as she has always been, a loyal and reliable friend and ally of our country.

"The Order of Ahepa therefore urges that the United States continue its military and economic aid and assistance to Greece.

"Many of our officers and members have recently visited Greece. They have found that law and order prevail and that conditions for visitors and tourists are most pleasant.

"If a European came to the United States and told the American people what type of government we should have, or whom to elect as our President, we would rightfully reject it as an unwarranted interference with our internal politics.

"The members of the Order of Ahepa feel that the type of government in Greece is a matter that concerns the Greek people only.

"As Americans, our only concern is that whatever Greek government Greece has should keep Greece as a member of NATO and a faithful ally of the United States."

SCHOLARLY JOURNALIST TO HEAD 20TH CENTURY FUND

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thorough economic scholars on the New York Times editorial board, Murray J. Rossant, has been elected director of the 20th Century Fund, New York City.

Mr. Rossant's departure from the New York Times is a loss that this Nation can ill afford at a time when honest, courageous, frank discussions such as he has shared with his readers are so seriously needed by the people of this country, and especially by their Government. His weekly Wednesday morning column gave

him an opportunity to act as a watchdog on the financial problems and opportunities confronting this country both at home and abroad. His many economic, political, and social editorials, although unsigned, were extensively quoted by Members of Congress of both parties and in both Houses including certainly myself.

Although at various times I have not agreed with Mr. Rossant's conclusions, I have found during my service in the Congress that his writings, first in *Business Week* magazine and the *London Economist* and later in the *New York Times*, added constructively to the dialog which is so often missing concerning how we can emphasize what is best and solve that which is less good.

The board of trustees of the 20th Century Fund have now given Murray Rossant an opportunity to supervise studies on economic and social problems, and I feel confident that he will pioneer some new approaches in a number of economic situations which are not being even studied or discussed by congressional committees or the executive branch of the Government.

Although Mr. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger and Mr. John B. Oakes have for the time being lost one of their most promising senior editors, it is really we in the Government and thoughtful people in business, labor, and the universities who will miss most the clear analyses which Mr. Rossant has shared with us for many years.

Text of the *New York Times* article of September 21 about Mr. Rossant appointment follows:

ROSSANT NAMED HEAD OF 20TH CENTURY FUND

Adolf A. Berle Jr., chairman of the board of trustees of the 20th Century Fund, announced yesterday that Murray J. Rossant, a member of the editorial board of *The New York Times*, would become director of the fund on Oct. 2.

Mr. Rossant, who has resigned from *The Times*, succeeds August Heckscher, who left as fund director last March to become the city's Parks Commissioner.

The fund is a nonprofit foundation that specializes in research and public education on the vital issues of the day, especially on economic and social problems. It was founded in 1919 by Edward A. Filene, Boston merchant.

Mr. Rossant, who has been with *The Times* since 1962, had been senior editor of *Business Week* and a correspondent for *The Economist*.

Mr. Berle also announced the appointment of John E. Booth as associate director of the fund. He has served with the State Department and the Economic Cooperation Administration in London and Paris.

A REAFFIRMATION OF U.S. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC GOALS NEEDED

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today's important legislative business made neces-

sary the cancellation of a speech I had scheduled this evening in St. Louis before the St. Louis Mortgage Bankers Association. The subject of my remarks was to be the increasingly restrictive trade measures now being discussed and the need to reaffirm the principles of the market place that underlie our international trade policy.

Because of the need to consider this matter openly and fully, I am taking this opportunity to insert my prepared remarks in the Record at this point:

AMERICAN FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY CHALLENGED

It is a great pleasure to speak to a group that represents a blending of my own deep interests. We have a community of interest in part because of my long association with a St. Louis financial institution. On another level we have a community of interest because of my congressional work involving our Federal financial institutions and monetary policy in relation to the Nation's economy. This work of course involves the whole range of the rather complex Federal monetary policy apparatus.

I was recently provided an opportunity to apply my banking interests to a practical problem when I discovered what I consider an inequity in the taxation of our private agricultural lending institutions. When the Federal land banks were created in 1916 they were granted exemption from all taxation. At that time the composition of the Nation's agricultural economy and the character of the financial institutions which served it were vastly different from what they are today. The tax exemption was probably justified.

But in 1947 Federal funds were retired from the Federal land bank system. Since then the land banks have operated as private organizations, and as private lenders they have been free to compete with other private lenders for the agricultural loan business. They have done so most effectively. In 1940 the percentage of the total dollar volume of the farm mortgages held by the land banks was only 8.3%. By 1965 the untaxed land banks' share of this business had climbed to 24%, while the share of their competitors, which are required to pay taxes, narrowed.

The issue here is certainly not some mere prejudice against agricultural lending. Neither is it a desire to get the land banks out of banking. My interest is instead tax equity and maintenance of a fair competitive situation in the field of agricultural financing. To me it does not seem equitable to tax some lending institutions while not taxing others. So in this case the issue is to state simply and clearly, and to apply equally, the rules of the competitive road, in the hope that the interests of the agricultural borrower and lender both will be served.

This case sets the context for my observations in the field of international economics, a subject which I consider of overwhelming importance to the national economy.

Many of you are no doubt aware that in the past several months—notably since the end of the Kennedy Round of international tariff and trade negotiations on June 30 this year—there has been an ever-swelling tide of bills that would provide special trade measures for individual commodities. There are now at least 15 such bills—it is difficult to be precise because the number grows steadily. The commodities covered range from insignificant to major. For example, special quota limitations are requested for all textile products, for steel, and for lead and zinc, but they are also requested for honey, prepared strawberries and olives.

The amount of import trade covered by these various import restriction measures has been estimated at \$12 billion dollars, out of

about \$26 billion of total U.S. imports in 1966. This is a tremendous volume of trade and, of course, as you would expect in foreign countries, the threat that the Congress could suddenly enact legislation affecting that amount of their own exports has caused great consternation. So concerned are these countries that they have told our State Department that they would have to retaliate against U.S. exports to them. Part of their reasoning is that their own domestic producers would rise up in arms to threaten them were they not to do so. Our own poultry producers in 1963 demanded that our government take action against the European Common Market when it adjusted its border restrictions to exclude American poultry exports.

Thus the current situation in Congress is serious for several reasons. One is that there are a number of quota bills which may well be brought to the floor of the Senate and be attached to an insignificant tariff measure already passed by the House. It is quite conceivable that the Senate could pass these bills, even though they have received quite cursory examination by the Senate Finance Committee, which is considering them.

Another is that special import action could be taken on behalf of certain individual industries when the real, underlying causes of their problems may not be imports at all, or when in fact the import problem is just part of a much broader problem that needs action on several fronts.

The possibility that Congress could act rashly in this field is worrisome to me for at least four reasons.

First, I believe that the proper function of Congress is to take up an issue in one of its appropriate Committees, call in the knowledgeable experts and laymen in the society to contribute their judgments and knowledge to the study of the problem, and then to make an informed decision.

There is certainly doubt that the Senate Finance Committee is capable of performing this study and deliberative function for the wide variety of very complex economic issues that confront it in each one of the numerous quota bills it is considering.

Second, I am deeply disturbed that the quota is the device being advanced to provide the barrier between the international marketplace and our domestic marketplace. I have very often expressed my conviction that in cases in which governments decide they must measure differentials in costs of production or means of marketing, such as subsidies and unfair trade practices, they should do so by means of a tariff, which is expressed as law and is applicable to everyone. A quota, on the other hand, requires administrative discretion and decision. It promotes government by men rather than by law. I believe that a quota is an entirely improper device to use to curtail trade flows.

Third, I am concerned by the possible Senate Finance Committee action because it is clearly contrary to the economic principles that have made the national economy strong, principles which by and large we have tried to promote in our international economic relationships.

I want to repeat these principles because they are so very important to the continued national economic well-being, both domestic and international: first, the market should determine what to produce and how much should be produced; second, profit should both reward successful business performances and continue to act as incentive for the development of new, profitable companies and industries; third, the best form of business organization is the broadly held stock corporation that mobilizes its capital through stock issues; fourth, it is better to go out and develop new and ever expanding markets than to defend old ones.

In these four principles rest the secret of a dynamic, innovative, greatly productive

economy. I can only ask that those industries that might seek to make imports the scapegoat for their more real problems take these principles to heart, just as I would ask the Congress to study seriously and thoroughly the real problems of these industries in order to take proper corrective action, even if that might finally be to control imports.

My fourth concern is again the issue of equity. How can one set of competitive rules be created for one group of industries and yet be denied to others? The economy is too closely interrelated to prevent a special measure for one industry or one company from affecting another industry or company.

To summarize, the quota bills in the Senate concern me for these reasons:

1. They have received only the slightest real study.

2. They use the dangerous quota device.

3. They would damage the economic philosophy of the marketplace that is so important to maintaining a sound economy in the long term.

4. They would create special favors for some industries at the expense of other, possibly more efficient industries.

The present legislative situation and the threats posed lead me to urge that we reaffirm the principles of the marketplace that underlie our trade policy, principles that have been lost sight of both by certain elements of the American business community and by those who are responsible for the administration of our foreign economic policy in the government.

In fact, trade restrictionism can be thought of as a two-pronged attack by: U.S. import quotas legislated by Congress on a multitude of industrial and agricultural products, and, international agreements negotiated by the Executive branch which have the effect of controlling trade artificially, both by quotas and by other means.

I have discussed the first "prong" of the restrictionist "attack". But the second, United States policy with regard to internationally traded commodities, must be rethought and reshaped.

For example, it was the Administration under the leadership of a former Under Secretary of State, that made the decision to press for the first true U.S. quota system, the comprehensive quota system that has been in effect for imports of cotton textiles since 1961. I believe it is no exaggeration that, in the numerous quota bills now before Congress we are witnessing the legacy of that fateful decision to resort to the quota as a device to control trade.

It was the Administration that set out to negotiate the present International Coffee Agreement, and the Administration that has tried to negotiate an international cocoa agreement. The Administration during the recently completed round of international tariff and trade negotiations pursued a policy of international commodity agreements for meat, dairy products, and wheat. These agreements were perhaps attempts to deal pragmatically with the real problems of world trade in those commodities, but they did not deal with the deeper problems, which are often rooted in the government-dominated farm programs most countries maintain.

Instead of trying merely to adjust international trade to take into account the differences in nationally controlled farm programs, the farm policy of this Nation should be to bring domestic U.S. farm programs into harmony with U.S. foreign trade objectives to reestablish marketplace conditions in both areas. U.S. farmers must achieve competitive pricing in the world market in the context of fair trade. The objectives should be to sell commodities for export at prices that are determined by the marketplace. This is the theory that underlies H.R. 7326, a bill I introduced on March 16, 1967 (CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, pages 6921-6922) to allow the market to function more completely and allow returns to farmers to be maximized by removing government price supports from U.S. wheat and feed grain production.

Thus my concern is that we reaffirm the principles of the marketplace in our foreign economic policies—this is the best offense against hastily-considered Congressional quota bills as well as against Administration-sponsored trade restrictive measures.

I have the following suggestions for constructive action in the present situation:

First, Congress should strengthen its study and deliberative processes in the foreign trade field. The Joint Economic Committee should study each year the entire foreign economic policy field in public hearings based on a comprehensive report by the Executive branch. In addition, the Congress should take steps to bring about coordinated consideration of foreign economic policy issues, which are now scattered throughout at least ten of the committees of the House and as many in the Senate.

Second, the quota bills now pending in the Senate should be considered in their proper legislative framework by being brought before the Ways and Means Committee for full hearings and study, and this should be done in the context of Committee study of the Administration's trade bill.

Third, there should probably be a rethinking of the means provided in the laws for giving trade adjustment relief from unusual import problems facing American industries. This is a complicated problem and I do not want to dwell on it at length. But there are clearly areas in which international trade flows may be unusually distorted or upset by world economic factors, or the particular practices of certain countries. The wholesale dumping of a commodity at distress prices in another country's market is one of those cases, and we do have an anti-dumping law and procedures to deal with such cases. Another clear example is the countervailing duty provision of U.S. tariff law, which provides that a product imported here at a subsidized low price can be restrained by a "countervailing" additional duty charge.

Perhaps there are other problems that should be taken into account in trade adjustment measures. For example, what about a case of a particular industry in a certain country that seems blindly intent on pursuing a policy of export expansion even at unremunerative (though not artificial) prices? Steel seems to be such a case. Here the Japanese, through continuing, probably injudicious, expansion of their steel capacity, have managed to increase their share of the U.S. market and to disrupt the European market by challenging European exporters to our market and creating strong price competition with the European industry.

Scholars of the subject describe the international steel market as a chaotic one, and my own findings, which I reported to Congress on May 1, 1967, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 11320-11337, confirm that such a disruptive situation exists.

Now, perhaps we might want to consider what means we can make available to prevent our steel market to be the dumping ground for a lot of excess capacity in Japan. By this I do not mean that I want to isolate the American steel market from the international market. But I do want to ask whether there may be grounds for defining the present world over-capacity situation as extraordinary and in a sense "unfair" to the domestic steel industry.

Finally, I would like to suggest another experimental idea. Perhaps we should rethink the institutional framework for our judgments about the problems of certain industries. Perhaps the role of the independent Tariff Commission should be strengthened to allow it to make quicker decisions about the provision of relief for certain "dis-

tressed" industries by means of a tariff adjustment mechanism, some sort of temporary relief measure that could be put in force pending the Tariff Commission's final decision about the economic merits or demerits of the case at hand.

These are ideas for consideration and discussion. They may not prove suitable, or even needed. But they might add to the dialogue on an issue that increasingly requires intelligent discussion, deep study, and careful Congressional decision-making.

BRITISH FROGMEN AID UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the recent wave of criticism leveled against our allies and their attitude toward Vietnam, it was interesting and refreshing to note Moscow's radio comment on this issue, citing British activities that aid the American effort.

As the chairman of the House Republican Committee on Western Alliances I am pleased at this evidence of cooperation among the free nations of the world.

Text of radio comment from Moscow to the United Kingdom as monitored October 24, follows:

BRITISH FROGMEN AID UNITED STATES IN VIETNAM WAR

British sailors are taking part in the hostilities in South Vietnam. A special team of frogmen from the British base in Hong Kong is being used in South Vietnam by the U.S. Command to clear the coast of deep mines positioned by the guerrillas to prevent the passage of U.S. warships. This has been reported by the London Evening Standard. The paper says the men are demolition experts and are blowing up the mines. They are thereby promoting the U.S. war.

Britain, our observer points out, is one of the two cochairmen of the 1950 Geneva conference and is called upon to insure that the international agreements on establishing peace in Indochina adopted by the conference are observed.

EXEMPT CERTAIN FARM VEHICLES FROM THE HIGHWAY USE TAX

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, without question the economic plight of the American farmer is growing steadily worse. He is struggling against record-breaking production costs, record-breaking farm debt and record-breaking agricultural imports that compete with the commodities he produces. He has very little hope that present inadequate farm prices will show any improvement in the near future. He knows full well that his plight is reflected in the farm parity

ratio which is now at the lowest point since the depression years of the 1930's. The future of the family farm in America has never been in more danger than it is today.

During these trying times of ever-increasing farm costs and depressed farm produce prices, it is essential that the farmer's cost of producing his products be kept at a bare minimum and that every means that Government has at its disposal to help reduce these costs should be employed.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill that would exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax. Under the provisions of this bill a vehicle would be treated as a farm vehicle for the taxable period if 90 percent or more of its use on the public highways consists of hauling agricultural products or equipment owned and produced by or for the owner of such vehicle to a point not more than 100 miles from the farm on which such products are produced, or hauling farm supplies to the farm of the owner of such vehicle from a point not more than 100 miles from such farm, or any combination of both of these situations.

I believe this bill would help reduce the farmers' cost of production. It is my hope that the Congress will favorably consider this legislation.

TAKE PRIDE IN FALLSINGTON

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the October 19 issue of the Bucks County Courier Times. It is most gratifying to observe what fine results such unusual community initiative and dedication can achieve. I commend to my colleagues in the House, and to all who read the RECORD, the following editorial:

TAKE PRIDE IN FALLSINGTON

Normally, and as a matter of journalistic principle, we don't like anyone suggesting what we should write. We make this rare exception.

At an abnormal breakfast meeting the other morning, Frank Wood, the fellow who has a finger in more Bucks County affairs than anyone we know, suggested we say something about Historic Fallsington, Inc.

Now since that was the only breakfast meeting (for two) we ever attended we may have been a bit vulnerable. Yet since, we have found such vulnerability perhaps very, very wise. Plus the fact we like Historic Fallsington, Inc. So, here's what we say.

In this day and age when so many of our people (including a lot of our Delaware Valley Protective Association and Upper Bucks County people) are asking for some sort of Federal handout for everything they aspire to do, it's infinitely refreshing to note that Historic Fallsington, Inc., has been doing during the past 14 years an almost impossible job of restoring an historic village of immeasurable significance with nothing but private funds.

This restoration movement has been a

dramatic thing, capturing the fancy and the admiration of folks in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware. It's been especially dramatic because the very large achievement has been done with funds contributed from the pocketbooks of interested people plus, of course, a bit of help from the Grundy Foundation.

Historic Fallsington, Inc., has been getting most astonishing results during its relatively brief period of existence. The astonishment must be attributed, to be sure, to the fact that yearning of a few dedicated people is being finally realized because of the generosity and understanding of a lot of other people of the truly historic and humanistic values involved.

We're sure that Fallsington Village, located as a charming island in this Lower Bucks County region of community, business and industrial progress, will become ultimately a community for historic pilgrimage from across the land.

We are also sure that the Fallsington Village, once restored, will not be a monument to federal government largess. Rather it will be the brightest of statues to a great number of individuals who cared enough about community and history and Americana to reach into their pockets and do something about the preservation of the precious all.

CZECHOSLOVAK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 29, some of my constituents will join in a celebration of Czechoslovak Independence Day.

While the administration insists there is a modification of communism in East Europe and courts increased trade with the governments of East Europe, those whose loved ones remain in those countries are well aware that they are still in captivity. Communication with them is difficult—even impossible in some cases. There is extensive poverty, propaganda, and pathos.

Not long ago a visitor to Czechoslovakia wrote, when safely returned to a free country:

Czechoslovakia is truly a satellite of the Soviet Union and in awful disrepair. The buildings are neglected, dirty, unpainted. On the main street, some buildings are being "fixed" for the benefit of tourists. . . . The people are depressed, for they have lost a tremendous amount of motivation. I found no one who said anything good about the regime.

This was in August of 1967.

In mid-October the press reported that the Czech Government had issued stringent new controls affecting the economy, religion, and literature. For years the country has been drained of consumer goods by Moscow. Creativity is discouraged. Recently writers, seeking wider range of expression, have been imprisoned.

Even the church is under strict Government control, and the youth of the nation are turning to drink and crime in large numbers, for what future can they expect under such a regime?

Yet the craving for liberty persists. Writers continue to write, smuggling manuscripts to the West, and releasing mimeographed copies on the black market. The clamor for more and better quality consumer goods continues. People remind the Communist machine of promises unfulfilled after 19 years. Every month some courageous souls continue to "vote with their feet"—and many succeed in escaping to freedom.

To those who live under such great difficulty, restraint, and pressure, we owe encouragement and ever firm, upright example. I salute those in Cleveland who are keeping alive the memory of brighter days in the land of their birth and renewing their hope for the return of freedom to that country in the near future.

ANTI-VIETNAM WAR RALLY

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, I personally witnessed the anti-Vietnam war rally in Washington which was, at one and the same time, a demonstration to the world of the rights and privileges enjoyed under our system of Government—and a demonstration of abuses of those rights and privileges.

I approve of the decision of our Government to allow the rally to take place. But I thoroughly disapprove the decision allowing the protesters to then march to the Pentagon with the intent of disrupting the war effort. The march did not add one iota to the case made at the mass meeting at the Lincoln Memorial.

At the Memorial, a crowd estimated at 55,000 had assembled. They were in an almost festive mood. Most were of college age, and many were notable for their obvious boycott of barber shops and beauty salons, and for their apparent aversion to soap and water.

Quite a few carried posters bearing various slogans, some of them unspeakably obscene. Some carried pictures of the late Cuban Communist revolutionary, Che Guevara, and others carried Vietcong flags—clearly displaying their pro-Communist leanings.

Although many things happened at the Lincoln Memorial that made one's blood boil—such as a moment of silence in honor of Guevara—this was the part of the protest which, in my opinion, was legal exercise in free speech—a constitutional right of all Americans.

I believe the march to the Pentagon and the demonstration at the Pentagon itself—where manifestly the protesters had no right to be—all with the approval of the General Services Administration, infringed on the rights of area residents and constituted a shameful abdication of responsibility by this administration—at a cost to the taxpayers of over a million dollars.

At the Pentagon, the carnival mood

disappeared and an ugly mood set in. Writing in the Washington Post of October 22, Jimmy Breslin, a Post staff writer, put it this way:

Taste and decency had left the scene a long time before. All that remained were these lines of troops and packs of nondescript kids who taunted the soldiers. They turned the demonstration for peace—these drifters in raggedy clothes—into a sickening, club-swinging mess. At the end of the day, the only concern anybody could have was for the soldiers who were taking the abuse.

The troops involved were splendid. Well disciplined, admirably self-restrained, they were a credit to themselves, their service and their country.

After spending several hours with the misfits, the dropouts from society, the Communist sympathizers and the out-and-out Communists, the actions of these fine young men in uniform were reassuring, to say the least.

And, thankfully, it is they—and not the protesters who comprise just a minuscule fraction of our young people—who will be our leaders of tomorrow. I am sure our future will be in good hands.

FREE SPEECH AND THE RIGHT OF DISSENT

MR. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, those familiar with my record know full well that I have always been a staunch advocate of free speech and the right of dissent. I have done some dissenting from time to time myself.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is well established in this Nation that freedom of speech does not carry with it the privilege of shouting "fire" in a crowded theater.

Nor does the right to dissent carry with it the right to preach sedition, anarchy, or treason. Yet in the district I have the honor of representing, I must sadly report that an English instructor at the University of Northern Iowa has been permitted to do exactly these things.

The teacher, one Edward Hoffmans, was allowed a full page in the student newspaper of this State-supported university to publish a vicious attack on the U.S. Government—an attack which included repeated exhortations to mass resistance to the draft, mass draft card burnings, and mass civil disobedience.

Hoffmans, in his rantings, goes on to tell the young men and women of the university that—and I quote him:

Anti-war strategy must move beyond dissent to offer the hawks a choice between foreign war and domestic anarchy or treason.

This man is clearly, openly, and aggressively advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government if that Government does not knuckle under to his way of thinking.

He says piously that most Americans—meaning the millions of law-abiding men

and women of this country—"misunderstand civil disobedience and so will misinterpret it as anarchy or treason or both."

Well, Mr. Speaker, let it be clear that this Member of Congress does not misunderstand and does not misinterpret.

I understand very clearly what this English instructor is teaching: Anarchy and treason.

I do not know what position the Governor of Iowa has or will take with respect to this firebrand on the State payroll. Nor do I know how many times the president of the university intends to allow this man to yell "fire" before he invokes the rule of responsibility that goes hand in hand with the right of free speech.

But I do know that this man, according to the newspapers, turned in his draft card to a Federal marshal this month, thereby breaking the law he has urged others to break.

If he is so filled with hatred and disgust for this country, as he apparently is, I shall be happy to contribute my fair share toward a one-way ticket to North Vietnam or any other Communist country so this man may learn firsthand just how free the speech is there.

Mr. Speaker, I include two excellent articles on this subject by Bill Severin, columnist for the Waterloo, Iowa, Daily Courier:

UNI SHOULD FIRE HOFFMANS

It is gratifying to know that the rantings of Ed Hoffmans, English instructor at the University of Northern Iowa, in the Northern Iowan, quasi official publication of the school, do not represent the thinking of any substantial part of the faculty or student body.

The people responsible for the college publication saw fit to permit Mr. Hoffmans to use a full page to make the most vicious attack upon the President of the United States I have ever seen in print, to advocate insurrection and anarchy and to urge impressionable young students to violate the draft laws.

Hoffmans, to give a general idea, says:

"Mass civil disobedience toward the draft should be made the focus of anti-war strategy: Registrants should publicly mutilate, destroy or turn in their draft cards, refuse induction, halt the operation of induction centers, and disrupt preinduction physicals by refusing to obey orders."

He says further:

"... anti-war strategy must move beyond dissent to offer the hawks a choice between foreign war and domestic anarchy or treason."

This latest example of bad judgment on the part of those responsible for the college publication has moved some of the most distinguished members of the University faculty to protest.

In a letter addressed "To the Students" and submitted for publication in the campus newspaper these faculty members have this to say:

"Ed Hoffmans, instructor of English, published a tirade against the government in the Oct. 10 issue of the Northern Iowan."

"We believe Mr. Hoffmans' recommendations to young men to deliberately break the law are contrary to the best interests of the students, the faculty, and the future of the University of Northern Iowa."

"We believe in freedom of speech but we do not believe it is proper for a state subsidized university newspaper to be used to encourage university students to break the law. Consequently, we will take any legal

means at our disposal to see that this type of material is discontinued."

"We do not believe that 'mass civil disobedience' is the best way to effect change. Consequently we urge you to think carefully before committing yourself to Mr. Hoffmans' radical recommendations. It has been our belief that the law should be respected until such time as it is changed. We believe Mr. Hoffmans' attitude to be more immature than most students."

This letter, at the time I saw it, had been signed by 16 members of the faculty.

At the present time there appears to be no responsible individual accountable for the content of the college publication. Bernard C. DeHoff, a highly competent journalist, is a member of the faculty and listed as the faculty adviser. But DeHoff says he has no authority or power to exercise any authority other than to check editorial copy for possible libelous material. He reports that he was given no opportunity under existing rules to read the article before publication.

Now I am going to offer a bit of gratuitous advice to Dr. J. W. Maucker, president of the University.

1. Give Mr. DeHoff the authority he requires to properly supervise tax-subsidized publications.

2. Suspend Mr. Hoffmans immediately from teaching responsibilities and follow this with any steps necessary under the rules of the American Association of University Professors to remove him from the payroll of this state institution. It is my understanding Mr. Hoffmans does not have tenure, which should simplify the problem of dispensing with his services.

HAZARD TO GENERAL WELFARE

The philosophy of civil disobedience or selective compliance with the laws of this state and nation being advocated by University of Northern Iowa English instructor Edward Hoffmans is one carrying with it no little hazard to the general welfare of the people of this country.

For example, there was a bearded senior law student at the University of Iowa in my office the other day who purported to be (and probably was) a spokesman for Mr. Hoffmans.

I asked this young man if he, as a student of the law, could support the philosophy of selective compliance with the law. "I believe in civil disobedience in the field of civil rights," he said.

This, I believe, illustrates the danger inherent in the philosophy of civil disobedience. The young law student felt he could justify violating the law in the field of civil rights. Mr. Hoffmans believes he is right in violating the draft laws and not long ago there was another citizen who advocated violation of the federal income tax laws.

And so it becomes abundantly clear that if constituted authority permits selective obedience to law then before long we will have no law at all. If this should happen we will have chaos and anarchy and we will all lose the civil rights and liberties which Dr. J. W. Maucker, president of UNI, is now holding up as a shield to protect the erring Mr. Hoffmans.

Dr. Maucker insists that "intellectual freedom" must be maintained at the University so that anyone may feel free to express any new idea, no matter how radical that idea may seem to others.

Well, Mr. Hoffmans or anyone else may express any idea that occurs to them either orally or by printed word without receiving any objection from me.

But Mr. Hoffmans was not expressing an idea in his full page essay in the University newspaper. He advocated in the "free space" provided partly by the taxpayers of this state and in his paid ad an illegal course of action to the young people who are expected to look

to him and other members of the faculty for instruction and guidance. In so doing he dis-qualified himself for the position he presently holds as an instructor in a tax supported school.

Hoffmans, and those who support his position, fondly try and compare his actions to those of our forefathers who rebelled against British rule and founded this great democracy. Hoffmans, himself, likes to compare his conduct with those colonists who participated in the Boston Tea Party.

No such analogy is valid. These colonial people were revolting against taxation without representation; against laws in which they had no voice in making.

In our democracy today the people have a voice, through their elected representatives, in making the laws under which we all must live. If a majority of the people conclude that any law is bad they can and do change it by due process of law.

It is not a speedy process. Socrates said more than 2,000 years ago "The state is a great and noble horse who is rather sluggish . . ."

The first president of the United States, George Washington, said in 1796 "The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

And more than 100 years later another great American, William Jennings Bryan said: "I believe every citizen should support the government when final action is taken, whether he approves of the action or not."

What do you say today, Mr. Hoffman?

TRIBUTE TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, October 27 marks the 109th birthday of one of America's finest statesmen and Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt. Fortune smiled on the Brotzman family when our son, Chip, was born on his birthday. The achievements of "Teddy" Roosevelt are numerous, but those of us from the West remember him first as a conservationist.

More than 100 million acres of land became national forests because of his continual encouragement and urging. It was during his administration as President of the United States that 26 million acres of public land was withheld for development as national parks, national forests, and irrigation projects. My own State of Colorado contains one of the five national parks organized and developed under the auspices of Theodore Roosevelt—Mesa Verde National Park.

It is probable that Roosevelt did more to organize Federal involvement in constructive forestry than any other one individual. Roosevelt National Forest—which was named for him—lies partly in my district. This forest contains 784,051 acres of the most awe inspiring scenery available in Colorado. We in the Second District of Colorado take pride in having a national forest with such an appropriate name. I thank you for the opportunity to convey my admiration and respect for Theodore Roosevelt.

WAR AND PEACE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend, Col. Earl "Red" Blaik, of Army and Dartmouth football coaching fame, writes a syndicated column the proceeds from which go into scholarships for deserving college students with gridiron ability. Recently Colonel Blaik wrote an article which I think carries a message for all Americans, particularly in reference to the so-called peace demonstration staged at the Pentagon last October 21. In simple yet moving language, Colonel Blaik puts the question of war and peace in proper perspective at the same time that he pays tribute to one of this Nation's Vietnam war heroes, the late Maj. Don Hollender. I urge all Members of the House to read Colonel Blaik's column, which follows at this point.

COL. RED BLAIK'S SYNDICATED FOOTBALL SERIES

(By Col. Earl (Red) Blaik)

Last week I read where Washington witnessed the march of 70,000 peace demonstrators whose object was to "confront the war makers in Washington and to surround the Pentagon as the symbol of evil."

What these demonstrators failed to comprehend is that the career soldier does not commit this country to war—war is the judgment of our civilian leaders elected and appointed. The Pentagon implements this judgment and the career soldier is the one whose duty it is to answer the call of his country—not to question why. These men, in going to war, leave youngsters and wives with a smile, but more often with heavy hearts as they realize there may be no return. For demonstrators to suggest that the men of the regular military service want war and the Pentagon is a symbol of evil is to forget that Sherman said "War Is Hell" and that MacArthur eloquently stated in taking the Japanese surrender on the U.S.S. Missouri, "It is my earnest hope and indeed the hope of all mankind that from this solemn occasion a better world shall emerge out of the blood and carnage of the past—a world founded upon faith and understanding—a world dedicated to the dignity of man and the fulfillment of his most cherished wish—freedom, tolerance, justice."

Military men abhor war as they know it in the raw and to them the action of the belligerent demonstrator is incomprehensible.

I am greatly saddened by the news that Major Don Hollender of Army football fame, has been killed in Viet Nam. Holly, like so many fine young Americans, made the supreme sacrifice in terrain better suited to wallowing barnyard stock. War, to Holly, meant leaving a lovely wife, four children and a devoted mother.

Last December, in accepting the Gold Medal Award of The National Football Foundation, I referred directly to only one former Army player and that reference was to Hollender. You will better understand this brave young officer and his dedication to duty from those remarks which follow.

Axiom—Good fellows are a dime a dozen, but an aggressive leader is priceless. The 1955 season was most trying for me as we

had a lean squad and no quarterback. A coach has never known trouble unless he has the senseless temerity to change an All America End into a "T" quarterback in one season. There was hardly an officer or cadet at West Point who didn't believe this switch was a colossal error. Even my friends of the Press called the move "Blaik's Folly."

Sunday afternoon after the Michigan defeat the Superintendent, my former football teammate, came to my office and inquired as to whether I was aware of the local sentiment about our quarterback. I told him that the team was aware, the staff was aware, and I was aware, but far more important they all believed as I did that our only chance to defeat the Navy was with Hollender at quarterback.

A few minutes after the Superintendent left, Hollender came to see me. As he entered the office I got up, placed my hand on his shoulder, and said, "Holly, you played a good game yesterday and I am proud of you. You're making fine progress as our quarterback." With moisture in his eyes, Holly replied, "I know what the cadets are saying, I have heard the officers talk, and I came fully prepared to get my old number back, but I want you to know I prayed all the way here that you would not give up on me."

Now, it is many weeks later. It is the night before the Navy game. As was usual, I took the squad for a bedtime walk on the golf course which ended with a few words about the big game. I recall saying: "Three times this season I took the long walk across muddy fields to congratulate first Benny Oosterbaan, then Ben Schwartzwalder, and then Jordan Olivar. It has been a trying season and I am a bit weary from those walks. Tomorrow before 100,000 spectators and fifty million television viewers I want you men to know it would be the longest walk of my coaching career if I cross the field to congratulate the Navy coach."

There was silence for a moment—then a voice spoke out with resolution. It was Hollender. "Colonel, you're not taking that walk tomorrow."

The Cadets won an upset victory over the Navy. The Press stated it was Holly's vindication. It wasn't—it wasn't at all. It was an unforgettable demonstration that an aggressive leader is priceless.

This priceless leader is now the late Major Don Hollender.

WHY NOT A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS ON THE EVE OF THE "50TH'S"?

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the recent issues of the RECORD show—and these by examples only—the popular demand for the creation of a Special Committee of the Captive Nations still is strong and persistent. The successful 1967 Captive Nations Week observance underscored extensively the urgent need for such a committee. Shortly, there will be many other Captive Nations Week examples stressing the vital importance of such a committee at this time.

THE "50TH'S" AND THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE

We are in the eve of not one but a number of 50th anniversary celebrations. Beyond the 50th anniversary celebration

of the Russian Bolshevik revolution are the "50ths" of the genuine, patriotic national revolutions of Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, and others. These non-Russian revolutions for national independence are of the same essence as our own American Revolution—national independence, the success of a foreign imperio-colonialism—in this case Russian—and the development of independent, democratic institutions. There is no better occasion than this to create the Special Committee on Captive Nations, with particular attention drawn to the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. itself.

On this theme, Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce into the RECORD the proclamation of Captive Nations Week by Gov. Spiro T. Agnew, of Maryland, and the article and book review, respectively, by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, on "Russia, Ukraine, and the World—50 Years of Conflict," and on "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, U.S.A. Versus U.S.S.R.," as appear in the autumn issue of the authoritative East European and Asian journal, the Ukrainian Quarterly:

GOVERNOR'S PROCLAMATION, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK JULY 16-22, 1967

Whereas, Silenced but unconquered, the enslaved peoples of East-Central Europe have never ceased their fight for a free life; and

Whereas, The people of the United States possess a warm understanding and sympathy for these subjected nations; and

Whereas, The cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas, At a time when anti-colonialism and recognition of the right of freedom for small nations is sweeping the world, a movement which the Communists are trying to turn against the West, it is vital for the United States to combine sincere support of independence for the new nations with the demand for the restoration of independence in the old nations of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Spiro T. Agnew, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim July 16-22, 1967, as Captive Nations Week in Maryland, and I urge my fellow citizens to offer prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of these countries so they may once more stand with the free nations of the world.

Given Under My Hand and the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, at the City of Annapolis, this 6th Day of July, in the Year of Our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Seven.

By the Governor.

SPIRO T. AGNEW,

Secretary of State.

RUSSIA, UKRAINE, AND THE WORLD—50 YEARS OF CONFLICT

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

The 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution isn't the only "50th" to be celebrated in this period of 1967-68. As a wholesome offset, and counteracting the basic fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, numerous celebrations in the Free World will mark the 50th Anniversary of the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence. From the celebration of Ukraine's Independence in January to Latvia's Inde-

pendence in November, the year 1968 will be highlighted with many ceremonial expressions of what was fundamentally the general non-Russian Revolution of Independence in the Russian Empire in 1917-18.

While captive White Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Lithuanians, Estonians and other non-Russian nationals are forced to join in the celebration of the "national holiday," dated November 7, really the day of tragedy for their independent national existences, free citizens in the Free World will observe the genuine revolution that occurred in 1917-18. Doubtless, while many unthinking Americans will participate in the Russian Bolshevik festivities, totally oblivious of what the tragic day of November 7, 1917 meant in time for the dozen and more independent non-Russian nations in the former Tsarist Russian Empire, the more informed and morally responsible will support the "50ths" of the non-Russian nations now in the Soviet Union.

There is a crucial difference in essence between the Russian Bolshevik revolution and the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence. Despite its fraudulent promises and objectives, the former was in essence a socio-economic revolution, aimed to eliminate autocratic Tsarist oppression, economic injustices, and sacrifices borne in war. It was to usher a new era of "proletarian democracy," "socialist economics," and "peace." On the other hand, the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence, as staged in Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan and elsewhere in the Russian Empire, had one consummate objective, namely the end of Russian colonialism and independent national statehood. In short, then, it was this revolution that partook of the same essence as our own American Revolution—surge of colonialism, the attainment of national independence, and the pursuit of free, national development.

Unfortunately, to this day, the non-Russian Revolutions for National Independence have not been clearly understood and certainly not appreciated by the democracies of the West. It is no exaggeration that the turbulent period of 1917-23, when these revolutions were in vogue against the new Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, has been a blind spot in general Western knowledge of East European and Central Asian affairs. The persistence of this blind spot constitutes one of the grave disadvantages of the Western democracies in their present Cold War contest with the Soviet Russian totalitarians. About this, there can be no doubt.

THE FRAUDULENT RUSSIAN BOLSHIEVIK REVOLUTION

By way of general observations on the celebrations of the "50ths" for the year ahead, it would be a terrible fallacy for any of our leaders to equate the fraudulent Russian Bolshevik revolution with our American Revolution, and because of a protracted ignorance on the subject, the prospect for this is not entirely negative. As Congressman Edward J. Derwinski has well pointed out, there are four determining factors about the Russian Bolshevik revolution.¹ "First, the Russian Bolshevik revolution was the source and incubator of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." The early destruction of the independent states of Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Azerbaijan and others substantiates this well. "Second," as he puts it, "The second colossal fraud of the Bolshevik revolution was Lenin's promise of 'land, bread, and peace.' This promise has been so negated, even to the extent of importing wheat from the capitalist countries in our day, that the fraud is glaring, to say the least." "The third prominent fraud," states Derwinski, "is

¹ "The Fraudulent Russian Bolshevik Revolution—The Vulnerable Russians," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 10, 1967, pp. 22286-22287.

Moscow's 'peaceful coexistence.' Moscow's involvements in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic, the Middle East, North Korea and other places demonstrate how 'peaceful' the coexistence is. And the 'fourth fraud,' he declares, "is communism itself, which has no objective existence and is entirely a deceptive ideological tool of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism." The myth of communism is yet to be fully exposed.

During the celebrations of the "50ths" these four determining factors should be pondered well by all free men. They embrace almost categorically a vast amount of detailed knowledge and data in the scope of what is called "Soviet history." Much too often we lose sight of the forest because of the trees. And this failing is Moscow's asset for further adventures and further aggressions under the banners of "peaceful coexistence" and "wars of national liberation."

FIFTY YEARS OF CONFLICT

If insight is to be reflected during this period, the "50ths" represent and symbolize above all 50 years of continuous conflict between those who support the results of the Russian Bolshevik revolution and those who side with the aims and aspirations of the non-Russian Revolution for National Independence. This is no oversimplification. For example, the record of Russian-Ukrainian conflict is quite clear. One need only recount the following highlights: the first international war between the Ukrainian National Republic and Soviet Russia, the upsurge of Ukrainian nationalism in the 20's, the stubborn resistance to Stalin's Russification program in the 30's, the gallant and heroic fight of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazi German imperialists and the Soviet Russian imperio-colonialists in the 40's, and the many manifestations of psycho-political resistance against Russian colonialism in the 50's to present date.

Anyone familiar with this record—and it is only one of the non-Russian records within the USSR these past 50 years—cannot but arrive at the firm conclusion that the USSR has never been a monolith. On the occasion of these "50ths," with clear perception and a firm grasp of the dominant factors, one can even advance certain clear working formulae on this issue. One is that the USSR—Ukraine (the largest non-Russian nation both in Eastern Europe and the USSR)=0. If perception and vision prevail, we can derive a more general formula from this, namely Red Empire—Ukraine=0, since the entire Red Empire is really based on ultimate USSR strength and power. The logic of these formulae are indisputable, given the record of so-called "Soviet history."

But logic is not enough. It must be supplemented by a genetical perspective of how all this came to be what it is. Such a perspective must begin with the period of 1917-23, when the first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism involved the conquests of neighboring, independent non-Russian states. The forcible annexation of Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine and the others into the USSR was the stepping-stone for further Russian expansion in power and control from the 40's to the present. Genetically, Russian involvement in Vietnam, the Middle East, Cuba and elsewhere are by no means irrelevant to that first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. By perspective, they are really founded on this early historical basis.

THOUGHTS FOR THE 50TH'S

Now, turning to the very present, one can raise again these appropriate questions in this period of the "50th's." "What about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia?" "What about Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, and Georgia?" "Indeed, what about Poland, Hungary, Cuba and others that are not situated within the Soviet Union, the imperium in imperio?" Apparently for the first time, these were some of the questions raised by a few editors

and commentators, like Huntley and Brinkley, after having heard on June 20 the hypocritical address delivered by Premier Kosygin to the U.N. General Assembly.

"In the course of its 50-year history," declared the Russian dictator, "the Soviet Union has regarded all peoples, large or small, with respect. Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union." This statement alone fully measures the degree to which the United Nations forum has been prostituted by Moscow and its Red Syndicate puppets and associates to advance their propaganda and diplomatic goals. What's even worse is that such statements, purposely repeated over and over again, go largely unchallenged and in time appear as "truths" to the uninformed, the unwary, and the uncritical.

Lying through his teeth, Kosygin well knows in his mind that the Soviet Union hasn't been in existence for 50 years. The establishment of the Soviet Union is not coincidental with the tragic Russian Bolshevik revolution. The USSR came into being in 1922-23 only after Kosygin's Soviet Russia had conquered and destroyed over a half-dozen non-Russian states, such as Byelorussia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Idel-Ural and others now held captive in the USSR. This first wave of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism he would seek to bury under the myth of the USSR's creation in 1917.

Also, Kosygin knows all too well that he sharply contradicts Khrushchev's famous admissions in 1956 of the rampant genocide, Russification, and politico-economic oppressions waged against the captive non-Russian nations, "large or small," under Stalin's rule. Ukrainians as well as the Chechen-Ingush, deported Lithuanians as well as the Crimean Tatars, Turkestani as well as the Bashkiri, all, large and small, have been severely ravaged by Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. With far greater subtlety and less barbaric crudeness these Stalinist policies have continued to this day, but the dour-faced premier of an empire unto itself would also have the facts buried by his shameless contradictions.

TIME FOR DEBATE DURING THE "50TH'S"

These cynical representatives of the world's worst imperio-colonialist system lose no opportunity in potemkinizing, i.e., in staging false appearances, as apostles of national self-determination and independence, not to mention "peace." The lengths to which they will go to conceal their own political crimes and at the same time firmly fortify their big lies were further shown in the United Nations this past spring. For example, the Russian mouthpiece, Pavel F. Shakov, insisted that Puerto Rico is a "colonial territory" and urged the U.N.'s colonialism committee to investigate this case of "American imperialism." Repeated enough with propaganda skill and cunning, such fabrications cannot but receive some credence in the minds of uncounted millions, particularly when our own representatives are found constantly on the defensive and often-times mute.

Clearly, the time is now to debate the fundamental issue of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. In fact, it is long overdue. As far back as September, 1961 President John F. Kennedy himself sensed the urgent need for it when in his United Nations address he declared, "Let us have debate on colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscite in every corner of the globe." This fitting challenge virtually paralyzed Khrushchev who, like Kosygin, ranted at the time about the USSR's defense of national independence and our furtherance of imperialism and colonialism. Two months later, our Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, unmistak-

ably directed this challenge against the widespread Russian imperio-colonialism within the Soviet Union itself.

The Stevenson memorandum of November 25, 1961 represents the best and most intelligent statement yet made on this basic subject by any of our ambassadors to the U.N. But in this world conflict where, with truths or with propaganda distortions and respectively for better or for worse, the minds and passions of men are shaped and moved, it is scarcely effective policy to deprive the truth and facts the impact of sustaining repetition and forceful elaboration. Over these years the Stevenson lead should have been expanded, developed, and detailed so that the spotlight of world opinion, study, and concern would be fixed on the imperio-colonialist network present in the USSR itself. After all, this is the determining power based in the Red Empire; it is the fundamental source of colonialist exploitation propelling Red designs and aggressions in Vietnam, Cuba and Latin America, Algeria and Africa, and in the Middle East; it is the resource reservoir of Moscow's frantic, technological push for space and military superiority, with all its blackmail implications.

In the U.N. debate on the Middle East crisis it wasn't exactly instructive or inspiring for any free man to view the acquiescent silence of the U.S. Ambassador on this subject while the Federenko, Kosygin, and Gromyko hammered away on "American imperialism," "American aggression in Vietnam" and other propaganda themes. To stop these boys in their tracks, all Mr. Goldberg had to do was to re-issue the Stevenson memo. Nor is it anything but another sign of weakness, especially after the Russians triggered the Middle East crisis, for our Secretary of State to say "We will continue to do our full share to try to improve relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist nations," as though the Soviet Union is a "nation" or any "nation" in the Red Empire, in conceptual contrast to a "state," is communist. Ostrich-like and befuddled diplomatic behavior cannot erase the stark reality of the captive nations, primarily those in the USSR.

TENTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1968

Because the undying aspirations of the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR for independence and freedom constitute a major lever, if not the key, for deterrence to further Red aggressions in the Free World, the avoidance of a hot global war, and Cold War victory in the cause of indivisible freedom, the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week in July, 1968 and during the "50th's" will highlight as one of its chief themes this necessary United Nations debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the USSR. A debate of this nature would encourage psycho-political forces within that substrate empire that colonialist Moscow would be compelled to reassess very carefully its stepped-up aid to totalitarian Hanoi, its rearming of extremist Arab factions in the Middle East, its back-up to North Korean guerrilla excursions into Free Korea, its support of Cuba and subversive operations in Latin America and, in general, its Cold War strategy and tactics toward the West. In this, genuine peace would be served, not further undermined as at present.

For those who have grasped the meaning and significance of the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86-90) and the annual observance, it is not at all surprising that at the Glassboro summit Kosygin was very anxious to learn whether the President would issue a Captive Nations Week Proclamation in July, 1967. Suggesting politico-moral surrender, the Russian dictator indicated that to do so would not improve U.S.-USSR relations. The President is reported to have replied, "If one is issued, the name Soviet Union would not be mentioned."

Since Congress passed the resolution in 1959, Khrushchev, Suslov, and numerous

other Russian totalitarians have vehemently denounced the resolution, and have sought its abrogation in the name of "improved relations," whatever that, in tangle deed, means. In 1966, in a tactical switch, Moscow egged its minions on to execute the task of public denunciation while it concentrated on backstage diplomacy, such as Kosygin's at Glassboro, to have the Week eliminated. For example, Latvia's *Radio Riga* blurted, "The announcement that the so-called Captive Nations Week has been proclaimed, reaches us from the USA like a demagogical ghost. . . . It cannot be fully ignored because such manifestations have become an important part of the U.S. political attitude" (July 17, 1966).

Another interesting switch was the attempt to associate the captive nations movement with anti-Semitism. For instance, the fall 1966 issue of *Political Affairs*, a Communist periodical, featured an article on "Anti-Semitism In The USA" which refers to "criminals who are active in the organizations of the so-called captive nations . . . have their own press and conduct war-inciting activities through demonstrations, picket lines, etc." This makes as much sense as the Russian genocidists in the U.N. recently accusing the Israelis of being "Hitlerite aggressors." But, as shown by the article, the Reds are apparently concerned that the "captive nations organizations are often connected with similar organizations in other countries in Europe and Latin America." And indeed they should be, for Captive Nations Week is now not only observed in the United States but also in over a dozen other nations.

The book *Captive Nations Week: Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope* (U.S. GPO, 1966) vividly describes in 310 pages the expansion of the Week both here and abroad. The 1966 observance was the best on record up to that year, the 1967 one surpassed it, and the Tenth Captive Nations Week Observance, that will be held during the period of the "50th's," will undoubtedly top them all. In addition to the President, thirty-seven Governors and fifty-three Mayors have issued proclamations regularly each year. As usual, Congress has led the observances with far-seeing addresses, and thirty-eight local Captive Nations Committees have conducted observances from Boston to Miami, Philadelphia to Spokane, New York to Chicago to Los Angeles. All major cities participated, and new ones have been joining for the first time.

What seems to disquiet Moscow and the Red Syndicate has been the addition of nations to the international observance of the Week. Argentina, Australia, Ceylon, and India have now joined South Korea, Japan, Free China, the Philippines, Turkey, Malta, West Germany, France, Great Britain, and Sweden in the annual event. President J. Onganía of Argentina has issued a proclamation that was prominently expressive of our Congressional resolution. Groups in Canada, Spain, Italy, Denmark, and Brazil have participated in the 1967 Week, and thus the list grows.

In a real sense, though the Week is observed every third week of July, it is not limited in activities to that week. The Week serves as a community and national forum to crystallize the issues and themes of the observance, but the participants devote themselves to actualizing them the rest of the year. The 1967 Week stressed the fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik revolution, and this message has been carried well beyond the Week. The objective of a U.N. debate on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism is but one major end requiring continuous action in the period ahead, during the "50th's" and well before the "10th," i.e., the Tenth Observance of Captive Nations Week next July. While the Middle East debate continues in the U.N., the known genocidal

treatment of Moslems in Turkestan should be of interest to those Arabs playing with colonialist Russian fire.

Other equally important themes in this eventful period of the "50ths," are: (2) unprecedented Congressional hearings on U.S. policy toward the USSR, (3) the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, (4) on the basis of the Dirksen-State Department agreement, a "Nyets Campaign against the establishment of Russian consulates" in our port-cities, (5) victory in Vietnam through psycho-political liberation of 17 million captive North Vietnamese, and (6) the full exposure of the fraudulent 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution which, as the writer shows in his current book *The Vulnerable Russians*, incubated the real force of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism that has produced the stark reality of captive nations and today threatens our security and world peace.

Each of these themes is a story in and of itself. Well before the "10th" Week, each will be advanced by constructive action based on the conviction that we can never afford the avowed enemy psycho-political sanctuary in his captive empire. Those who delude themselves with the achievements of paper agreements might well take a leaf from Karl Marx—"Russia only throws out so many notes to the Western diplomats, like bones to dogs, in order to set them at an innocent amusement, while she reaps the advantages of further gaining time."

THE CHANGING STRATEGIC MILITARY BALANCE, U.S.A. VERSUS U.S.S.R.

(By a special subcommittee of the National Strategy Committee, American Security Council, Chicago, Ill., 1967, pp. 103.)

(Reviewed by Lev E. Dobriansky)

One of the most important and constructive works prepared by the American Security Council is this careful and systematic analysis of the really changing strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The study was done at the behest of the Armed Services Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives. It was undertaken by a special subcommittee made up of distinguished members of the American Security Council's National Strategy Committee, all with vast experience in military strategy and technology. General Bernard A. Schriever, General Curtis E. Le May, Admiral Felix B. Stump, Dr. Edward Teller, Professor Stefan T. Possony, and General Albert C. Wedemeyer are only a few of the well-known names gracing the special subcommittee.

Regardless of one's political persuasion, this study is *must reading* for every alert American leader and every thoughtful American citizen who treasures the blessings of national freedom and personal liberty. Several Members of the House Armed Services Committee have already expressed themselves in complete agreement with the findings of the study. One deliberative legislator on that committee now regards this studied work as his "bible." And indeed it can be so regarded, for it strives toward maximum objectivity, achieves an unusual clarity of expression, and presents in a most telling way the facts of the comparative nuclear picture between the United States and its prime, avowed enemy. In short, the picture is horrifying for us, if present development and policies are permitted to continue. Notwithstanding this, the picture is drawn in this study with unemotional description and analysis, with a sound scholarly approach and hard-core reason.

A rapid succession of chief points in the work will alone reveal the superlative nature of this study. As pointed out clearly in the foreword, the work is based on "unclassified sources only." However, judging the back-

grounds of the members of ASC's subcommittee, one needn't think twice about the perspectives and insights that guided this study on the basis of "unclassified sources only." Quite pointedly, reference is also made to the fact that the Russian installation of missiles in Cuba "came as a complete surprise to official Washington despite the massive preparations which had extended over several months." A few of the subcommittee members were in active duty then and at the highest echelon of our Government. The foreword is explicit, too, in defining the bases of the study. For one, the strategic weapons systems "are considered to be forces designed to carry out long-range strategic missions and to carry the main burden of battle in a general nuclear war." Second, like kinds of weapons—ICBM's with ICBM's, strategic bombers for strategic bombers, etc.—are used for the U.S.—USSR comparison, and not only the numbers are involved but also the yield of nuclear warheads.

The authors of the study also adopt the measurement provided by Mr. McNamara, namely the payloads of the missiles and not just their numbers. In other words, the comparative megatonnage of the delivery vehicle, the missile itself. They also make the striking point that Secretary McNamara omits from his estimate of comparative megatonnage the USSR's 900-odd Badgers, which are comparable to our phased-out B-47's and have an intercontinental range with in-flight refueling, and about 750 IRBM's based in what they call "western Russia." This plus other factors, according to the authors, tip the scale of overall nuclearity in favor of the USSR.

It is somewhat regrettable that this excellent study is marred by a recurring misconception of the USSR. "Russia" is used indiscriminately, as though the strategic, military posture of the USSR cannot be affected by stimulated politico-economic pressures within that peculiar state. There is no question that Moscow seeks victory over the United States, whether in the Cold War or a hot global war in which it would try for a knock-out nuclear first strike. In the event of the latter we, too, would seek victory, and the non-Russian nationals in the USSR would be a crucial force for us to consider. We should be considering it now for Cold War victory. Thus the major criticism of the study is this basic and unfortunate misconception that precludes any possibility for outweighing to some extent Moscow's growing nuclear superiority. A few nuclear strikes in the territory of the USSR would produce such chaos that the latent non-Russian force would inevitably come into full bloom.

Of course, our military strategy should effectively aim at the avoidance of a nuclear outbreak. Only complete nuclear superiority can guarantee such stability in the relative strategic picture, and we should strive for it regardless of what Moscow does. Our current policy of mere deterrence and equality will fail to provide this guarantee. It is essentially non-innovative, stagnant, and perilous. We should be applying the same principles of technologic innovation in this field of military technology as our economic system does for every other conceivable sphere of cultural activity. A basic cultural discrepancy exists here, and increases the chances of a global holocaust. To afford the enemy the opportunity of a first nuclear strike, to refrain from an innovative pursuit of complete superiority in all essential fields, such as ICBM's, IRBM's, long-range bombers, military-space technology, and hydronuclear development, and to expose ourselves to further "surprises," which is the stock in trade of typical Russian cunning and deceit, scarcely constitute a true cost-effective policy, founded on vision, experience with the Russians, and long-range wisdom.

In addition to the statistical tables justifying the prime finding of this study, the reader will acquire much food for thought in the

many perspective and insights surrounding the issue. One, for example, is the well supported observation that "The Soviet Union has a goal of strategic superiority designed to win a nuclear war than merely deter one." Another is that "Soviet ABM tests in 1961 and 1962 provided the knowledge which has permitted the U.S.S.R. to rush ahead with its ABM development and outstrip the United States." The Nuclear Test Ban treaty has already placed us at a distinct disadvantage in this vital respect. In short, the study is packed with incisive observations and judgments. Its contribution to inevitable changes in policy is incalculable.

CZECHOSLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it important to point out to the House that Saturday, October 28, is the 49th anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence Day, when after World War I Czechoslovakia was formed as a new nation.

We all understand the tragedy that befell the peoples of Czechoslovakia as a result of misguided World War II diplomacy, when along with many other peoples of Eastern Europe they were literally handed over by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill to the Soviet Union. The Soviets thoroughly eliminated democracy in Czechoslovakia and the country remains controlled by a Soviet-imposed Communist dictatorship.

As we have said to others, Mr. Speaker, we must not accept the permanence of Communist control in Czechoslovakia and Eastern Europe. We must realize that peace in the world will remain threatened as long as the peoples of captive nations remain under Communist rule.

SLOVENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, October 28, is the anniversary of a very significant, but too often overlooked, page of European history and represents the Slovenian proclamation of independence after the fall of the Austro-Hungarian empire. Slovenia was incorporated into the kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Slovenes now suffer under the dictatorship of the Communist Tito regime.

The Slovenes and the other peoples of Yugoslavia had hopes for the development of a legitimate democratic government after World War II, but since then have found themselves captives of

a Communist dictatorship which continues to deprive all the people of Yugoslavia of their basic rights.

It is important for us to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia has been anti-Israel in policy and is supporting the aggression of North against South Vietnam. Despite aid originated under the Truman administration, on key issues Yugoslavia has aligned itself against the United States and free world nations.

History demonstrates the legitimate interest of the people of Slovenia for self-determination and the independence that Slovenia sought after World War I is still denied them. Hopefully, we can develop a world of true peace and freedom in which the people of Slovenia will finally enjoy a proper government of their own.

DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE PENTAGON

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to prohibit demonstrations at the Pentagon because I feel strongly that this is not a proper place for mass protest.

I cherish as much as anyone the right to dissent. But it is inexcusable and unacceptable to use that right to disrupt the orderly functions of government, without which the right to dissent cannot exist.

No U.S. court or government has ever suggested that freedom to dissent is freedom unchecked. Yet, the rash of antiwar and antidraft protests occurring throughout the country, in violation of court injunction, in disregard of the rights of personal safety, is being allowed to approach that unchecked freedom.

The conduct of these antiwar demonstrators at the Pentagon last weekend was disgraceful beyond description. They shouted complete disrespect and disregard of our Government, its leaders, and our fightingmen in Vietnam. They spread litter and trash wherever they were. They defaced the Pentagon with painted obscenities.

It cost the U.S. Government and hence the taxpayers over \$1 million to handle the mob and clean up after it.

It is way past time that our Government had proper tools to take care of this dire threat to law and order—yes, even a serious threat to our kind of society.

There can be no doubt that this antiwar march gave the Communist enemy great courage and sustenance. The Premier of North Vietnam broadcast thanks before the march began to their "friends in America and wished them great success in their mounting movement."

The Nation cannot permit demonstrations at the Pentagon during a time when

we are fighting one of the major wars in all our history.

Without the very costly bringing in of troops to protect the building and the people who work there, the conduct of the business of the Department of Defense could have been seriously interrupted. Our fightingmen in Southeast Asia could have been jeopardized.

My bill will prevent recurrence of any other demonstrations of this sort. I hope the House will pass it quickly.

THE REALITIES OF VIETNAM: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR REPUBLICANS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the extremely well thought out research paper of the Ripon Society entitled "The Realities of Vietnam: An Alternative For Republicans." This paper, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 4, 1967, on page 27916, by the esteemed Senator from Oregon, MARK HATFIELD, proposes a responsible and feasible alternative to the dangerous military escalation being pursued by the Johnson administration.

I hope very much that my colleagues in the House will give careful consideration to the highly persuasive proposals in the Ripon document. The Ripon paper demonstrates convincingly the failure of the Johnson administration to develop any realistic political approach to a Vietnamese society interlaced with intricate religious, ethnic and regional rivalries. Blindly insisting upon a centralized nation-building course, the Johnson administration has supported the suppression by Saigon of many local non-Communist groups. This misconceived policy has frustrated the creation of any broad-based non-Communist coalition in rural Vietnam. Moreover, the destruction by Saigon of local non-Communist leadership has abetted recruitment efforts of the Vietcong.

The response of the Johnson administration to the failure of its political strategy in Vietnam has been a monotonous but dangerous military escalation. Hundreds of thousands of American fighting men have been sent to South Vietnam and millions of pounds of American bombs have been dropped in both North and South Vietnam. Yet today the military rulers in Saigon enjoy little public enthusiasm. Meanwhile, anti-American sentiment among non-Communist South Vietnamese is rising to unprecedented levels.

Something must be drastically wrong with a policy which has incurred the enmity of the South Vietnamese intelligentsia, has devastated much of rural South Vietnam, has created millions of refugees, has cost thousands of lives and billions of dollars. Yet all we hear from the White House is a clamor for more of

the same—more American troops or more bombing of the North.

If the Republican Party is to be true to the American people and to our national tradition, it must offer a choice not an echo to the counterproductive and dangerous Vietnam war policy of the Johnson administration. The Ripon proposals would substitute a highly realistic political approach for the almost exclusive military tactics of the present administration.

Under the Ripon approach a decentralization of rule in South Vietnam would give local ethnic and religious groups a much greater incentive to cooperate in a non-Communist coalition. Meanwhile successful piecemeal negotiations with Vietcong cadres would tend to drain away the Vietcong recruitment base. By offering the Vietcong village cadres an opportunity to continue to hold their social roles as village organizers as long as they cease insurgency, this approach would wean away many war weary Vietcong. Today under the Chieu Hoy program these Vietcong cadres must give up their entire social status and enter distant defector camps.

The Ripon confederal approach would also set the stage for an eventual negotiated settlement with the National Liberation Front. The success of piecemeal negotiations with the Vietcong cadres could then reassure the NLF hierarchy that they could lay down their arms without fearing extermination by the South Vietnamese Army. In view of the widely publicized slaughter of Indonesian Communists by the army, it is extremely likely that strong assurances of physical survival would be necessary in order to reach a negotiated settlement with the NLF.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD press comment and statements of public officials concerning the Ripon research paper:

GOVERNOR ROMNEY'S STATEMENT ON THE RIPON SOCIETY'S VIETNAM PAPER

The Ripon Society should be commended for its penetrating study on the course of development in Vietnam. "The Realities of Vietnam" is a highly perceptive job and contains several creative ideas about elements necessary to any true solution of the conflict. I have long held the view that our limited objectives make impossible a purely military solution and that a satisfactory outcome must be based on fundamental effort within the South Vietnamese Society itself and on finding a way to deal with the Viet Cong infrastructure. An alternative to present policies is clearly necessary, and the Ripon paper not only identifies, through its sharp and impartial analysis, the need, but also proposes for examination some of the possibilities for an alternative.

GENERAL GAVIN'S STATEMENT

A brilliant analysis. One of the best things I have read on Vietnam. I intend to discuss the Ripon paper thoroughly with General Westmoreland when I visit Vietnam next month.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1967]

WAR NEGOTIATIONS AT A CADRE LEVEL?

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

President Johnson's persistent question of "what would you do?" has finally produced an answer. Admittedly, the chances of its adoption are remote, both in Washing-

ton and Saigon. Quite probably resistance to such a scheme from Hanoi would be great. In short, it is a longshot, but it is a new idea.

The idea is basically to turn the whole theory of negotiations upside down. Instead of talking about negotiations between Washington and Hanoi or even Saigon and Hanoi, begin instead at the lowest level inside South Vietnam.

The proposal was put forward first by Robert Shaplen, the *New Yorker* magazine's experienced and incisive correspondent in Vietnam, in *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the American foreign policy Establishment.

Now essentially the same idea has been offered by the Ripon Society, a minuscule liberal Republican group which, though it has no political clout, has gained a grudging respect because it does some intelligent thinking.

Central to both the Shaplen and Ripon presentations is the idea that the political cadres of the Vietcong in South Vietnam are not the totally subservient creatures of the government in Hanoi which the American Government generally pictures them to be.

The Ripon pamphlet declares that the VC cadres "assigned below the provincial or district level are not usually ideologically motivated." Many low-level cadres "seem to have learned and applied new political methods to take over their native villages without necessarily liking the Communists who trained them." Some cadres from middle-class backgrounds, so Ripon says, "may even become inwardly hostile to the Vietcong command because it mechanically gives preferential promotions to their lower-class rivals."

Shaplen is more cautious. He writes that "many if not most of them have been well-disciplined Communists" although "a good number" of them "have been disillusioned" and their "lives have been deeply disrupted by the ever-increasing violence of the war." And he adds that "there seems little doubt that the Southern cadres, no matter how thoroughly indoctrinated with communism they have been, and how well disciplined, still resent being ordered about in the execution of their revolutionary duties by Northern political and military officers."

Both Shaplen and Ripon stress the feeling of Southern separatism among much of the population, including the VC cadres. And both accept the cadres as the key to who rules the bulk of the South no matter what American forces may do against North Vietnamese troops.

The Ripon idea is to "abandon the goal of extirpating" the VC cadres from the villages, "allow them to hold their social function, while neutralizing their military threat." The way to do this, to sum up an overly intricate presentation by Ripon, is to make local bargains which give the more malleable of the VC cadres a part in local life and a chance for the future under a non-Communist Saigon regime.

Shaplen writes of "the chance to be 'legal' at the low levels and to compete more openly than clandestinely with Saigon's representatives"; in short, and "opening to the left" by the Saigon regime.

Each of these proposals sees such a step as the basis for later moves further up the political power ladder. Both say it will take a long time. And both say it will require certain risk-taking by both the United States and the government in Saigon.

The Ripon pamphlet is a political document at heart. It lambasts the President for his "style of secrecy and silence," makes many unsubstantial charges such as "many leading policymakers" (unnamed) "believe in the inevitability of a war with China" and says that Washington is likely to give its proposals a cold shoulder. It has hardly offered a soft-sell.

Shaplen, on the other hand, declares his support of a continuing United States in-

volvement in Southeast Asia affairs though he terms today's commitment "confused and undefined." In such a situation he argues for working for a political solution "with the best elements among the Vietnamese we can find."

Either fashion of presenting the idea quickly summons a host of objections, beginning with a bureaucratic unwillingness in Washington to shift gears so violently and a seeming determination of the military regime in Saigon to consolidate rather than to disperse its power.

Still, the President has been asking that question with little response in the realm of reality. Neither Shaplen nor Ripon can claim they have discovered a foolproof answer, but at least they are offering thoughtful answers.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP GROUP ASKS DISPERSAL POLICY ON SAIGON POWER

(By David S. Broder)

The Ripon Society proposed yesterday a "new look" Republican policy for Vietnam keyed to dispersal of powers from Saigon to the provinces and local "piecemeal" negotiations with the Vietcong.

The liberal Republican research organization offered the "confederal" strategy in a 30,000-word paper as its answer to the long-sought "responsible alternative" for the GOP on Vietnam.

The report was hailed as "highly perceptive" by Gov. George Romney of Michigan and as "a brilliant analysis" by retired Lt. Gen. James Gavin, both prospective candidates for the Republican presidential nomination and critics of Administration policy on the war.

The study was written by two 26-year-old doctoral candidates, J. Lee Auspitz of Harvard and Christopher W. Beal of Tufts University.

Accusing the Johnson Administration of a "prideful commitment to a misconceived policy," the Ripon paper called for de-escalation of the bombing of North Vietnam but held out little hope of an over-all negotiated settlement this year. It warned that continuation of the present strategy risks war with Communist China and might eventually involve two million allied troops in Vietnam.

Key to the proposed counter-strategy is the contention that the Johnson Administration's "attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon . . . are doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences" among the non-Communist forces in South Vietnam.

The Ripon study argued that "the loyalty of these groups could be assured by conceding political powers to local leaders, instead of the Saigon-appointed administrators who now hold sway."

In the first stage of the effort, which the study said could begin immediately, provincial and district elections would be held in non-Vietcong areas and the elected leaders given control of taxes, police and militia, land reform, schools and U.S. aid programs.

In the second stage, the same autonomy would be offered to areas—estimated in the report at half of rural South Vietnam—"where the Vietcong and non-communist leadership coexists" in an informal truce.

"Piecemeal negotiations," the report contended, could wean local Vietcong cadres away from their terrorist tactics and anti-government activities in return for "a recognition of their legal function as village organizers." This in turn, it argued, "would permit a substantial reduction in the number of allied troops required for pacification programs."

In the third and final stage, bargaining would be extended to hard-core Vietcong areas, where their local autonomy might be conceded in return for a national settlement with Hanoi.

Such a strategy, it argued, would "reduce the American commitment in installments, much as the present policy is destined to escalate it by installments."

[From CBS News, Walter Cronkite News, Oct. 5, 1967]

REMARKS BY ERIC SEVAREID

Liberal Republicans continue to make the running in the pressures on the Johnson Administration for a change in its Vietnam war policy. What it seems to amount to is an early phase in an undirected, piecemeal search for a coherent opposite party position on the Asian dilemma. But some of the latest moves at least have a tinge of originality about them.

Illinois' Senator Percy, with some Democratic support, today introduced a Resolution telling the President in effect to get tougher with some of our Asian allies who declare that the fight in Vietnam is essential to their security but whose own people do none, or very little, of the dying.

This move happens to come on the day when American dead and wounded passed the hundred thousand mark, not including those dead and incapacitated by accidents and disease. The Koreans have nearly fifty thousand men in Vietnam, paid for by us; the Australians have about six thousand; no one doubts the fighting qualities of either force but neither force has seen much sustained heavy combat. The Thais have now gotten around to sending a couple of thousand fighting men; the Philippines have sent in about two thousand construction troops. The Chinese Nationalist on Formosa, whose foreign minister told the UN today that Red China is out to conquer the globe entire, have no troops in Vietnam, but that is because Washington doesn't want them there, for obvious political reasons.

Early speculation today that the administration welcomes this Senate Resolution in order to give the President more leverage on the Asian allies, seems doubtful. There seems to be, some worry in the Administration that the Resolution could upset what may be promising negotiations for considerably more fighting men from one or two of those countries.

The other new approach this week comes from the group of young, liberal Republicans called the Ripon Society; this is a broad, long-range proposal to change our military and political strategy right around; to reduce the commitment by installments; they think this could be done by giving up the effort to build a unified South Vietnam nation with a centralized government; by accepting the country as the decentralized, regionalized mosaic it is; by turning back political powers to localities, district by district, including local elections and local negotiations with the Viet Cong.

It is a bold blueprint, almost the total opposite to the one we are now trying to follow in Vietnam.

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 7, 1967]

THE WASHINGTON CIRCUIT

(By James Doyle)

Last Tuesday three young men from Tufts, Harvard and MIT held a news conference here to unveil one of the most thorough and scholarly proposals yet injected into the Vietnam debate.

In 30,000 well-chosen words the three doctoral candidates, who are members of the egghead Republican Ripon Society, drew a picture of Vietnam government as it really is, a dispersal of power across the countryside, residing in the hands of village chiefs and Vietcong cadre leaders.

Their suggestion: That the Americans force the Saigon government to recognize this by dispersing its military power and its aid in a similar manner, driving wedges where possible between Hanoi and the local

cadre leaders. They called for piecemeal negotiations with the little VC over local matters, hopefully weaning them away from their Hanoi allegiances, and setting the stage for Hanoi-Saigon negotiations eventually.

The news conference was carried in the next day's New York Times in a two-paragraph shirtdial to the dramatic story of Everett Dirksen and William Fulbright debating the tired Vietnam arguments on the Senate floor.

The networks ignored the event completely, in favor of more blood-and-guts film from the war zones.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) News, Oct. 4, 1967]

BRICKBATS FOR L. B. J.—RIPON SOCIETY OFFERS PLAN TO SPLIT RANKS OF VIETCONG

(By Peter Lisagor)

WASHINGTON.—A group of young Republican graduate students and professional men says the Johnson policy in Vietnam is based upon the "fiction" of a centralized democracy that ignores the fragmented character of South Vietnamese society.

The group known as the Ripon Society calls for a program of recognizing the strong local ethnic and religious differences in Vietnam and of dealing directly with the non-Communist elements on a province and district level.

In a subtle stage-by-stage proposal, which it describes as a "confederal strategy," the society also would sanction a relationship with local Viet Cong cadres, as distinguished from the Viet Cong hierarchy, on a "live-and-let-live" basis in an effort to split the enemy ranks.

The group contends that the VC cadres play a vital role in the village social structure in three-fourths of the rural population of South Vietnam, and a way must be found to let them maintain this social function while neutralizing them as a terrorist or military threat.

In a 30,000-word report titled "The Realities of Vietnam," and subtitled, "An Alternative for Republicans," the Ripon researchers flatly dispute the administration's contention that the VC are dominated and controlled by Hanoi.

Under their plan of co-existence in the contested village, the "cadres who are not ideological Communists and are not dependent on the North for supplies would perceive differing interests from those trapped in the Communist hierarchy."

The Ripon group joins the currently intense congressional debate over the bombing of North Vietnam by asserting that "punitive bombing North of the 18.5 parallel simply does not save American lives" and risks a greater loss of both American and civilian Vietnamese lives.

U.S. policy today is described as doomed to failure because the non-Communist forces consists of many "jealous groups that cannot be ruled from Saigon."

Only by conceding power to local leaders instead of Saigon-appointed administrators can the loyalty of these diverse factions be assured, the study says, adding that these leaders "hate the . . . army of Saigon just as much as they hate the Communists."

Lee W. Huebner, president of the Ripon Society, and the two co-authors of the detailed report, J. Lee Auspitz and Christopher W. Beal, affirmed their right to offer an alternative as members of the generation of men fighting the war.

[From the Providence Journal, Oct. 5, 1967]

VIETNAM ALTERNATIVE

A "responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies" in Vietnam has been proposed by the Ripon Society, an unofficial GOP study and research group. Termed a "confederal strategy," the plan is keyed to political decentralization in South Vietnam, and it warrants the closest study

and reasoned debate by concerned Americans.

The society argues that the Johnson administration's effort to create a strong, centralized government in Saigon flies in the face of the simple fact that South Vietnamese society is deeply fragmented on ethnic, religious, and political lines. Centralization may be possible but only at great cost in lives and men.

The society would recognize the existing pattern of diverse elements by extending political authority to accepted local leaders, the all-important figures in national life, instead of maintaining the system of appointing outsiders from Saigon. A large measure of autonomy, including authority in handling some American foreign aid, would be lodged in the local leaders.

The proposed system would be put to work, first, in pacified areas but as it took root it would be extended into areas of disputed control and even eventually into areas where the Viet Cong now run things by virtue of their control over local leaders. Inroads on the Viet Cong could be made by granting local control on land tenure regulations, for instance.

As for the war itself, the society would halt punitive bombing in North Vietnam while maintaining interdictory bombing as necessary in the south to cut infiltration and troop buildup. As the new system of political decentralization took hold, the society believes that the American presence could be reduced in time for total withdrawal.

The society makes a good case. It has taken years for South Vietnam to get as far as it has in building a viable central democratic government. It will take still more time for the new government to get on its feet, learn the machinery of democracy, and make it work. Meanwhile, as things now stand, the fighting appears sure to continue for years.

The society believes that the Republican Party could be returned to power in 1968 if it adopted the proposed alternative to the Johnson policies. The society argues that a Republican President in 1968 could bring about a resolution of the Vietnam War just as President Eisenhower is credited with inducing a settlement of the Korean War when he assumed office.

Politics apart, the society's proposal offers a divided and concerned nation a significantly different and soundly reasoned alternative to policies which got us into Vietnam and which, so far, offer little hope for a final resolution of the war without the spending of more billions of dollars and the loss of more American lives.

The proposal ought to be brought into the current debate in Congress on the course of the war; it warrants thorough public hearing by the appropriate House and Senate committees. The society's proposal is like a fresh wind blowing through a smoke-filled room; it may not be the final answer but it is a heartening start on a new search for that answer.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 4, 1967]

RIPON SOCIETY URGES VIETNAM CONFEDERATION

(By Paul Hope)

Calling President Johnson's Vietnam policy a "fiasco," the liberal Republican Ripon Society has proposed a new strategy aimed at producing a loose confederation of groups in South Vietnam instead of a centralized government.

The society, composed largely of scholars and headquartered at Harvard University, said its "confederal strategy" could become the "long sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

The Ripon Society, perhaps the most articulate voice on the Republican left, made its proposals as criticism of the administra-

tion's policies continued to escalate and as Republican leaders began to find themselves in wide disagreement on what should be done in Vietnam.

In the past few days, several Republicans in the Senate have called for de-escalation of the war but none has come up with a concrete plan.

The Ripon Society believes it has found the plan which the Republican party should put forth as it goes into the 1968 presidential election.

BOMBING HALT ASKED

It would halt the bombing in the North and begin a program of negotiating with local leaders to pacify the countryside.

Lee W. Huebner, Ripon president, characterized the program as something between a "hawk" and a "dove" stand, in that it would not be a withdrawal but would de-escalate the fighting.

The lengthy Ripon document said that non-Communist forces in South Vietnam are fragmented into many jealous groups that cannot be ruled from Saigon. It said the Johnson administration attempt to set up a centralized government in Saigon "is doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences."

"The loyalty of these groups could be assured by conceding political powers to local leaders instead of the Saigon-appointed administrators who now hold sway," Ripon said.

The society proposed three phases in its "confederal" program:

LOCAL AUTONOMY

First, guarantees of local autonomy would be offered to non-Communist groups who report infiltrators. There would be provincial and district elections, direct access to U.S. aid, local administration of land reform, local taxing powers, local control of police and militia and use of ethnic languages in primary schools.

Second, the same framework would be offered to villages where Communist Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership co-exists. Ripon says that studies show that many Communist village officials "are more concerned with their village role than with the ultimate Communist aim of winning the entire country."

"A confederal strategy would promote factionalism in the Viet Cong and unity among non-Communists; the present policy does the reverse," Ripon said.

The third phase would extend confederal bargaining to hard-core Viet Cong areas. This would offer Viet Cong leaders control of their enclaves as part of a national settlement.

TALKS HELD UNLIKELY

Huebner said that because of the U.S. election, he sees no chance of North Vietnamese officials coming to the negotiating table during the next year whether the bombing of North Vietnam is stopped or intensified.

The society accused Johnson of "secrecy and silence" on Vietnam and of relying on a "contrived atmosphere of crisis" and of blitzing Congress with questions, "the answers to which are predetermined by carefully controlled briefing."

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Oct. 4, 1967]

REPORT OFFERS ALTERNATIVE IN VIETNAM—REPUBLICAN GROUP URGES AUTONOMY OF VILLAGES, DISTRICTS

(By George R. Packard, 3d)

WASHINGTON.—The Ripon Society, a liberal Republican group based in Boston, published yesterday a proposal on Vietnam which it called "the long sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

In a 30,000-word research paper compiled

by two graduate students, it called for a "confederal strategy" by which local villages and districts would be dealt with individually by the Saigon government and U.S. officials.

Calling the present government in Saigon a "faction of centralized democracy that is doomed to failure," it said that dissident Vietnamese religious, ethnic and local groups could be won over by "conceding political powers to local leaders."

TWO AUTHORS

The Ripon Society, a research group which is not party-sponsored, describes itself as composed of young moderate or progressive Republicans. It was formed after the 1962 election and named after Ripon, Wis., which claims to be the party's birthplace.

Neither of the two authors of the Ripon report has been to Vietnam.

One of them, Christopher W. Beal, 26, is a Ph. D. candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Medford, Mass. The other, J. Lee Auspitz, 26, is a Ph. D. candidate in history at Harvard.

TAUGHT IN FRANCE

Auspitz is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Auspitz of 6752 N. 13th st., Philadelphia, and a 1959 honor graduate of Central High School. In his summers while in Harvard he taught at a camp for underprivileged children in southern France and worked for the Jerusalem Post in Israel. He studied at Oxford University, then worked on a newspaper in Liberia and was press adviser to the government in Nigeria.

Auspitz and his wife, the former Katherine Holahan, of Livingston, N.J., also studied at the University of Vienna, Austria. They have a three-month-old child, Rachel Berthe.

GUARANTEES OF AUTONOMY

In the first phase of the Ripon report's "confederal strategy" for Vietnam, guarantees of local autonomy would be offered to local non-Communist leadership group in South Vietnam who maintain internal order and report infiltrators.

Such groups would hold their own elections, have direct access to U.S. aid (now channeled through Saigon), use their own ethnic languages in primary schools, and carry out their own land reform, tax and police functions.

Provincial and district officials now are appointed by the central regime in Saigon.

In the second phase, which might begin after a year, the same offer would be made to villages where Viet Cong and non-Communist leaderships coexist. Such an offer, the report says, would "divide the loyalty of many Viet Cong cadres from the Communist hierarchy."

OFFER TO VIETCONG

In a third phase, the report continues, "confederal bargaining would be extended to hardcore Viet Cong areas." It would offer Viet Cong leaders control of their enclaves in the countryside in return for the cessation of terrorism and an end to their attempt to overthrow the Saigon government.

Under this strategy, bombing of North Vietnam could be stopped and some American troops withdrawn, according to the authors.

The plan rejects either escalation or withdrawal. The report appeared in the September issue of the Ripon Forum, the society's monthly publication that reaches about 1,400 subscribers in Boston, Los Angeles, New York, New Haven and elsewhere.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 5, 1967]

REPUBLICANS SUGGEST VIET POLICY

WASHINGTON.—The Ripon Society, an unofficial Republican research group, has proposed that the United States adopt a decentralized political approach in Vietnam

keyed to conceding political powers to local leaders.

It described its proposal as a "confederal strategy" in contrast to attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon.

"It is the conclusion of the Ripon Society that the present structure of policy is built on an expensive fiction about what South Vietnam is and what it can become," said a study released by the society.

"Against the concept of a centralized democracy," it said, "is the reality that non-Communist forces in South Vietnam are fragmented into many jealous groups, with strong local, ethnic and religious differences, that cannot be ruled from Saigon."

"Inherent in the present policies in Vietnam," the society said, "are the dangers of: wasting American men and resources; turning South Vietnam into a nation of thieves and beggars; drifting toward war with China and the Soviet Union."

In advancing its proposals, the society expressed hope they could become "the long-sought responsible Republican alternative to President Johnson's war policies."

STEPS TO AUTONOMY

Local leaders would receive guarantees of autonomy in the following ways:

Control over local police and militia.

Election of provincial and district officials who now are centrally appointed.

Government officials of local origin.

Local rule in formulation of land tenure regulations and reform.

Redrawing of provincial boundaries "to correspond to the realities of political control."

Cultural guarantees to ethnic minorities.

The right to collect local taxes, supplemented where necessary by direct access to United States aid.

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Enterprise, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP GROUP SEEKS TALKS WITH VIETCONG

WASHINGTON.—A group of young Republicans proposed yesterday that the United States negotiate immediately with the Viet Cong as a step toward peace talks with Hanoi after the 1968 U.S. elections.

In a 30,000-word policy statement, the Ripon Society also accused President Johnson of sponsoring a "misconceived" Vietnam policy through a "contrived atmosphere of crises."

Composed of young Republicans from the business, professional and academic communities, the society charged there was insufficient civilian control over the Defense Department and that Johnson uses "secrecy and silence" to stifle congressional dissent on the war.

The study said there was little hope for meaningful peace negotiations until after next year's elections and called instead for "piecemeal" negotiations with the Viet Cong.

The Ripon plan called for peace in three stages.

The first stage would guarantee local autonomy to non-Communist areas of South Vietnam, including free elections and direct U.S. aid which is now channeled through Saigon, local taxing powers and local control of the police and militia.

The second stage would make the same guarantees to areas where the Viet Cong and non-Communist governments coexist. In exchange for the guarantees, the local Viet Cong leaders would have to agree to end their antigovernment activities.

The third stage would deal with areas under Viet Cong control. It would offer the guerrillas control of their enclaves in the countryside as part of a national settlement.

Ripon President Lee Huebner, a Harvard University graduate student, said the strategy would split the Communists, splitting the Viet Cong from the Hanoi government.

Huebner said the proposal has received

favorable reaction from retired Gen. James Gavin, a strong critic of the administration's Vietnam policy, and Sens. Thruston Morton, R-Ky., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., leading GOP "doves."

[From the Boston Globe, Oct. 4, 1967]

GOP OFFERS VIETNAM PEACE PLAN

WASHINGTON.—The Ripon Society proposed on Tuesday a Republican policy for Vietnam keyed to dispersal of power from Saigon to the provinces and local "piecemeal" negotiations with the Viet Cong.

The liberal Republican research organization offered the "confederal" strategy in a 30,000-word paper as its answer to the long-sought "responsible alternative" for the G.O.P. on Vietnam.

Key to the proposed counter-strategy is the contention that the Johnson administration's "attempts to set up a centralized government in Saigon . . . are doomed to failure because of the strong local, ethnic and religious differences" among the non-Communist South Vietnamese.

In the first stage of the effort, which the study said could begin immediately, provincial and district elections would be held in non-Viet Cong areas and the elected leaders given control of taxes, police and militia, land reform, schools and U.S. aid programs.

In the second stage, the same autonomy would be offered to areas "where the Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership co-exists" in an informal truce.

"Piecemeal negotiations," the report contended, could wean local Viet Cong cadres away from their terrorist tactics and anti-government activities in return for a recognition of their legal function as village organizers.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1967]

WASHINGTON, October 3.—A group of young Republicans proposed today that the United States negotiate immediately with the Viet Cong as a step toward peace talks with Hanoi after the 1968 elections.

The Republicans said there was little hope for meaningful peace negotiations until after next year's elections. It called instead for "piecemeal" negotiations with the Viet Cong "to provide a basis for ultimate national negotiations."

In a 30,000-word policy statement, the Ripon Society also accused President Johnson of sponsoring a "misconceived" Vietnam policy through a "contrived atmosphere of crises."

Composed of young Republicans from the business, professional and academic communities, the society charged there was insufficient civilian control over the Defense Department and that Mr. Johnson used "secrecy and silence" to stifle Congressional dissent on the war.

[From the Harvard Crimson, Oct. 4, 1967]

SAIGON ADVISED BY RIPON SOCIETY TO RELAX REINS

(By John A. Herfort)

Non-Communist groups in South Vietnam should be given considerable autonomy by the central government in Saigon as a positive step toward limiting future U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war, the Ripon Society proposed yesterday.

In a Washington press conference, the Cambridge-based group of young, moderate Republicans alleged that "instead of seeking to foster a political system built upon grass roots support, American policy has been occupied with a dream of centralized democracy radiating out from Saigon."

The Saigon regime is unable to attract much popular support in the provinces as long as it monopolizes government activities, Ripon said.

The group said local authorities should have control over police, local militia, and tax collection. In addition, there should be election of provincial and local officials now appointed by Saigon.

According to Ripon, this would be a "confederal policy"—one that would set up a loose anti-Communist coalition of many Southern groups by delegating some of the central government's duties to local groups to make it worthwhile for them to oppose a Vietcong takeover.

The Ripon proposals are a sharp departure from most criticisms of the Johnson Administration's policy.

They did not, for example, focus on the Administration's failure to stop bombing North Vietnam and its inability to get peace negotiations with Hanoi. Instead, the thrust of Ripon's argument was that the Administration did not predicate its policies on the political and social realities of South Vietnam.

If their proposals—already implemented successfully in one province, could be repeated throughout the country, Ripon said, U.S. and South Vietnamese forces would spend less time on comparatively ineffective search-and-destroy operations. Then they could concentrate on protecting newly secured areas from main-force Communist invasions.

Their proposals appear to come down on the "dove" side of the opposition to the Administration. For they ask "that steps be taken to reduce the drain on American resources."

The report also proposed:

That the bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong, and other cities of the North be ended.

That remaining U.S. air raids should aim to cut infiltration and North Vietnamese troop buildups, and be held close to the 17th parallel.

That hard-core Viet Cong areas might ultimately be brought into a confederated framework by offering them the same kind of autonomy other areas would receive.

That the problem of land reform be left to local government.

In any case, the Ripon report, for all its novelty, is sure to be replaced with considerable bitterness by the military junta in charge of the Saigon government.

[From the Yale Daily News, Oct. 23, 1967]

RIPON OFFERS VIETNAM PLAN

The Ripon Society's Vietnam "peace" proposal was lauded last night by political science professor H. Bradford Westerfield as a sound addition to a Republican presidential campaign.

The 30-page Ripon document offering an alternative to the present Vietnam policy was evaluated at a Ripon Society meeting featuring Westerfield, history prof. Harry S. Benda, and J. Lee Auspitz, one of the study's authors.

Westerfield, a "hawk" on the Vietnam controversy, said: "The study could be useful to a Republican presidential hopeful who wants to look a little bit more dove than Johnson, but not too much."

TWO REALITIES

Auspitz, also an editor of the Ripon Forum, gave an outline of the Ripon plan to open the discussion. He said that two realities must be confronted in Vietnam before a workable solution could be reached.

The first, according to Auspitz, is the fragmentation of domestic political groups. The second is the role of the Viet Cong as "the closest thing to a central administration that South Vietnam has ever had."

Professor Benda, a war "dove," said that these two points are the most revolutionary and the most laudable parts of the report.

The Ripon plan, according to Auspitz, would be based on "confederal" strategy progressing in stages. In the first stage, local

autonomy would be given to non-Communist areas.

In the final stage, the Viet Cong would be reached. Auspitz said: "There would be piecemeal negotiations, offering Viet Cong leaders local autonomy in return for neutralization."

Benda noted that the United States would have to stay in Vietnam to negotiate the many local governments and hold them in the "confederal" system. He said, "It is a dangerous proposition to think that the U.S. is the best, the kindest, the ablest, and the wisest arbiter to put together the framework."

Westerfield said success would be possible only after a substantial number of years. He said: "What reason have we to suppose that the Viet Cong will accept the plan unless we put them under more pressure in the places where they are entrenched?"

Westerfield said his enthusiasm over the Ripon proposal was based on its inherent aim of de-escalation. He said while the plan might not immediately reduce troops, it would eventually have to, if successful.

Commenting on the prospective Republican candidates who could use the Ripon proposal, he mentioned Rockefeller and Percy, but ruled out Romney.

"Romney's the only one who praised it," Auspitz said.

"He's been brainwashed again," Benda said.

KEEP SBA INDEPENDENT OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again it appears that an effort is being made to reorganize the Small Business Administration and to transfer some of its more important functions to the Department of Commerce. Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, I view this latest effort to strip the Small Business Administration of its effectiveness with concern. The problem we face now is not new, for, from its very inception there have been those who have said that the SBA should fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. However, the Congress, for very good reasons, wrote into the original Small Business Act in 1953 assurances of this agency's continued independence.

Section 4A of that Act states that the SBA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government." This provision was written into the law because it had been amply demonstrated that the small-business segment of our economy needed its own agency geared to provide one-stop service without becoming another fragment in the diffuse organization of the Department of Commerce.

We now find that section 406 of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, passed by the Senate and reported by the House Education and Labor Committee, contains provisions to transfer vital procurement and management assistance functions from the SBA to the Department of Commerce.

Section 406 vests in the Secretary of Commerce virtually all procurement and management assistance functions and more so. As a matter of fact, it vests in the Secretary of Commerce more powers, and provides him with more authority than the SBA's procurement and management assistance program ever had.

If section 406 were to be accepted by the House of Representatives, the Small Business Administration's rightful functions would be scrambled into a confusing process which would sharply limit the effectiveness of the effort. Both the SBA and the Department of Commerce would clearly work at cross-purposes, often in overlapping activities, and in different directions. Why it is necessary to vest authority in a second agency to do what the SBA can and is successfully doing, is difficult to understand. By enactment of section 406, nothing would be added to enable the Government to carry out the congressional intent. By its enactment, we would achieve a full measure of confusion, wasted motion, and wasted Government funds.

Should section 406 remain in the bill, the Small Business Administration, which for 14 years has carried on with distinction its mission of assisting the interests of small business, would be burdened with an unnecessary partner.

I hasten to say this is not intended to reflect on the nature, the character or the efficiency of any other agency or program. This is entirely another question and not relevant to the issue here.

Certainly, the SBA has had its problems of survival over the years of its existence. Through most of its life, nevertheless, this agency has performed its mission well.

SBA has distilled the experience gained through many years of effective activity. I am not opposed to this combined effort because I do not wish the SBA to cooperate with other branches of Government. On the contrary, the SBA has repeatedly worked with other departments and agencies to be certain that whatever the program, no possible assistance should be omitted for the small enterprises of the Nation. This effort should continue.

In the present instance, however, the plan envisioned in the new bill would serve only to attach relatively inexperienced personnel to decisionmaking positions affecting assistance to small businessmen. By so doing, I am convinced the total effort of the SBA will seriously suffer.

In the interest of maintaining a vigorous Small Business Administration focused upon the important role it has been assigned, I urge the Members of the House to carefully study what is being proposed here prior to the formal debate on the OEO bill and be apprised of the dangers which are involved in this portion of the legislation.

AIR QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, in its report on the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce states:

The bill is intended primarily to pave the way for control of air pollution problems on a regional basis in accordance with air quality standards and enforcement plans developed by the States.

I agree with this statement. I strongly believe that it is a State's right to determine and achieve that air quality which is deemed best for the health of its people, and which its industry, its business community and its citizens can afford.

For many years, long before the Federal Government recognized the problem, the State of California has been faced with the urgent task to remedy a rapidly deteriorating air pollution situation. This problem was brought about by an unusual combination of topography and climatic conditions, and great population density in its urban areas. Over 100 State laws promulgated to date have resulted in an effect program of air pollution control and abatement which today serves as a model for the entire Nation. This program is tailored to the needs of the State of California by responding to its unique and specific air pollution problems; its standards take into account the technological and financial capability of its citizens to meet them. And this is the secret of its success.

Abatement of automobile exhaust pollution is not necessarily dependent on factory installed equipment, although the Detroit manufacturers would have us believe so. It was California which originally motivated the development of add-on "afterburner" type controls. Improvements to this approach continue to be made, and cost-effectiveness may well prove equal to the factory equipment in the near future. Thus, no State or region should have to be tied forever to the technology of Detroit. It is not difficult to see why the primary manufacturers want to retain control over their product. But this scheme may not be the best for achieving cleaner air.

The right of a State to impose stricter standards than "minimal" nationwide ones must not be preempted. The Senate, in its Air Quality Act of 1967, has recognized this by instructing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to waive Federal preemption for States with stricter air pollution abatement standards on their books than those prescribed by the Federal Government. This exemption applies only to California. As written, there is no possibility that other States could qualify to result in 50 different standards as the automobile industry implies. But this clause is vitally important to the State in the Union with the largest population.

This clause was deleted in the House committee for the benefit of the automotive industry, but in clear violation of the concept of State rights, and in open disregard of the health and welfare of 20 million people.

I urge all the Members of the House

to familiarize themselves with this issue which is to come before the House next week, and to insist on reinstating the waiver clause in section 208(b) of the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

CENSUS BUREAU BOONDOGGLE

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during these days when the House finally is beginning to respond to the wishes of the people out across America, and voting for some economies in the operation of the Federal Government, I find the bureaucrats still have not received the message.

In a release from the U.S. Department of Commerce, dated October 20, 1967, there is another example of intervention of the Federal Government into the private lives of all Americans, wasting thousands of dollars, on the subject of "Marriage Stability."

Apparently the Census Bureau has nothing better to do with their time and countless employees than to research the habits of the people, and then offer "advice for young unmarried." The Members of this Congress know the Bureau of the Census was created to count people, and it was never intended to make studies of the age, educational background, and migratory habits for the purpose of relating it to marriage stability.

The big brother image of this administration seems to be taking a turn in the direction of what appears to be a gigantic, federally subsidized "advice to the lovelorn" project.

While we are looking for areas to reduce Government spending, regulation, and control, it seems to me this is one of many places to blow the whistle and not only eliminate prying into private lives, but paying people with taxpayers' funds for projects never intended or needed.

ARMS SALES TO UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days there have been many statements and articles critical of the possible sale of American F-5 aircraft to certain Latin American countries. Most of these remarks appear to be conditioned reflexes more than reasoned judgments. The question of arms sales to underdeveloped nations is a very difficult one which usually presents itself in the form of unattractive alternatives. Which alternative is the lesser

evil will depend not on doctrinal attitude but upon a closer view of the particular question at hand.

A careful and objective analysis of the problem was presented recently by the distinguished columnist, Carl Rowan. His comments should be read by all of us who serve in this body. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Rowan's column at this point in the RECORD:

CRITICS HIT STRAW MEN ON LATIN ARMS (By Carl T. Rowan)

"Beggars can't be choosy."

That is the substance of what Senator Wayne Morse and like-thinking Americans keep urging the State Department to say to Peru and other Latin American countries.

And it is precisely this insulting nonsense, growing out of ill-considered notions of liberalism, that is going to plunge the United States into deeper and deeper trouble in Latin America.

I am referring specifically to the weeks of haggling over whether or not the United States ought to sell Northrop F-5A fighter planes to Peru, Brazil and other Latin countries.

Morse and some of his colleagues constantly fulminate about an "arms race" in Latin America. They imply that the selfish oligarchies in these countries are taking milk out of the mouths of babes by squandering the continent's resources on military toys for over-powerful armies and air forces.

Critical as I am, on some counts, of the Latin American oligarchy and the military rulers, the truth is that Morse and his colleagues are mostly shadow-boxing at straw men.

Sol M. Linowitz, himself a distinguished liberal and U.S. envoy to the Organization of American States, said this to the Inter-American Press Association last Thursday:

"Latin America spends less on arms than any other part of the world. Approximately 90 percent of its military expenditures is for upkeep of military and defense establishments and only 10 percent is for acquisition of new military equipment. In fact, in the past 20 years defense budgets as a proportion of total expenditures have dropped 50 percent."

The second error the Morse crowd makes is that it shows a lack of knowledge of human nature. It is absurd to think any Latin country is going to be without a military machine—surely not after the Cuban experience. And civilian leaders are going to have to keep the military leaders reasonably pacified in order to maintain civilian control and move steadily away from the pathetic old days of military coups and countercoups. And no military leader is going to stay pacified if his forces are limited to horses and buggies while the rest of the world flies supersonic jets.

Thus, it is the most reasonable thing in the world for Peruvian leaders to try to buy the F-5, a more-or-less supersonic fighter, to replace their obsolete, dangerous aircraft.

But Morse and other congressmen have urged the United States to adopt a policy of denial of such aircraft to countries like Peru and Brazil.

The argument, noble on its face, is that people are hungry in all these countries, so it is sinful to waste meager resources on planes and other arms.

The trouble is that it is the United States that is the big waster of resources on tools of death and destruction. And the United States has more impoverished people than any country in the hemisphere with the probable exceptions of Brazil and Mexico.

So it was a case of Big Daddy Uncle Sam saying to the little Latinos: "Don't do as I do, do as I say."

Any Latino audacious enough to mention this aloud was to be quickly told: "The dif-

ference, you see, is that we are wasting our own money. We aren't asking for foreign aid from anyone."

And that is just an arrogant, not-terribly-diplomatic way of saying, "beggars can't be choosy."

The State Department is to be commended for facing a troublesome reality and authorizing belatedly the F-5 sales despite certain knowledge that it would produce another scream from Morse.

Characteristically, the Oregon Democrat noted that had State not done so the Peruvians might have bought costlier, faster Mirage V aircraft from France.

"What we should have said," Morse argued, "is 'go and buy them from France and get your aid from France, too.'"

When we have a supposedly liberal, enlightened senator who thinks the State Department ought to be constantly reminding people that they are taking handouts from Uncle Sam, and warning them that this obligates them to tailor their policies to our bidding, there can be little wonder that we are occasionally held in contempt by people who really wish to be our friends.

FAITH IN THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE REAFFIRMED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the youth of America face a cruel and ruthless enemy, while the shells of Communist guns from North Vietnam shower their death and destruction on these young men defending a nation from invasion, here in America a minority of individuals loudly proclaim their disloyalty to these men. Parading in the streets of this Nation's Capital, they defy their Government's decision to protect the freedom of South Vietnam and in so doing give the Communist enemy of this country the will to continue to fight, hoping for victory over our own fighting men. Each protest, each demonstration, each word of encouragement to the enemy, adds another list of dead and wounded Americans to the toll of Vietnam.

In the midst of this unpatriotic outburst, I have had the pleasure of visiting with a man who reaffirmed my faith in the American way of life and this government by the people. This man knows what it means to answer the call to duty of his country, for he became a symbol of the willingness of the men of this Nation to stand up for that which is right.

This man is James Gordon of the Blue Ridge Mountain country of Virginia. He remembers the horrors of World War I in the Argonne Forest of France because he was there. He was there because his country had a draft lottery, because a blindfolded Government official pulled a number from an oversized fishbowl and because that number was his.

Just a little over 50 years ago on July 20, 1917, the Secretary of War walked into room 226 of the Senate Office Building and, at 9:49 a.m. reached into the 14-inch opening of the fishbowl containing 10,500 small capsules, each of which contained a registration number.

He broke open the capsule and the number—written in red ink—was an-

nounced as "258." For James Gordon and others holding "258" in draft precincts throughout the country, this signaled their call to active duty.

For James Gordon, the draft ceremony in the Senate Office Building, and even Washington itself, were a long way from his Madison County, Va., farm. So were the trenches of France. But within 11 days the Madison County Selective Service Board sent him a draft notice. He reported 6 days later and a month after that, on September 5, 1917, he was inducted at Madison County Courthouse.

This Saturday, October 28, James Gordon will be 77 years old. He has no regrets about serving his country—in fact, just the opposite, for he views his induction into the Army as voluntary even though he was drafted. He remembers that as a farmer he could have claimed an exemption and been excused from active duty.

While visiting with Mr. and Mrs. Gordon at their ranch home several weeks ago I remember his saying:

I could have got out of it, but it was a good thing to fight for your country. We had a nice, free country here. It's a little different now, but if I was a young man, I'd do the same thing again.

After 50 years, this man who is typical of the Americans who have made this Nation strong and free, still feels the same devotion to our country as he did when he was 27.

With Congressmen spending most of their time nowadays in session throughout the year, we become engrossed in the maze of the Washington scene, and reading the newspapers and listening to newscasts, we know that the world is in constant turmoil. We view with apprehension dissent of our own people against our Government, we view with alarm young men openly defying the laws of this country by burning their draft cards and sympathizing with the enemy, we are shocked by the riots and rebellion of certain groups who destroy a part of their own country by their actions.

To visit with the Gordons was like returning to a "little bit of heaven" that used to symbolize the American home. Living serenely among the peaceful farms surrounding them, the Gordons reflect the strength that is America. Their attitudes of loyalty, this willingness to sacrifice in order that America might be perpetuated for future generations, came as a refreshing breeze amidst the turmoil and confusion of the headlines dealing out the thoughts from the tangled minds of hippies, peaceniks, Communists, and racists.

When you visit in this area you see America as it really is. You see a people, full of faith, whose basic philosophy is reflected in the plaque which hangs near their front door, "With God all things are possible."

That philosophy is carried out in both actions and words. Mr. Gordon told me that he supported the President—not because he was President Johnson—but because he was President. He said he believed that 9 out of 10 people these days did not realize what a great country this is, and that was one of the problems which was causing people to dissent. He

said people were not "thankful" for this country, that they had been misled into believing all of this was free for the taking without any responsibility on their part.

While sitting there, looking out at the grandeur that is part of Blue Ridge Mountain country, I realized that it was the convictions of the people like the Gordons, scattered throughout our country in the cities and on the farms, that had made this Nation continue its existence.

When loyalty ceases to be a virtue, when patriotism and love of country is defiled by both young and old, when our Constitution and the laws of the land are openly disobeyed in thought and deed, we shall have ceased to be a nation. When the actions of some of our people tend to torpedo our national commitment, and we tolerate this and refuse to stand out against such ruinous disloyalty, we have through negligence aided and abetted this cause of destruction.

Silence and indifference, while the American way of life is ridiculed and belittled, is the sin of omission. We, too, will be responsible if we but shrug our shoulders or look the other way.

Involvement is a part of our heritage. While no one would wish to deny anyone the right peacefully to disagree, we have the responsibility of doing as much or more than the dissenters, in persuading and encouraging just the opposite of their dangerous creed.

I am convinced that if more Americans had spoken out, there would be no demonstrations. And, if there had been no demonstrations, the war in Vietnam would be over. The loss of American lives would have ceased, and peace would have been returned to the world. South Vietnam would be insured of its freedom, and North Vietnam allowed to choose the yoke of communism if it so desired.

I was reminded of the words of former President Harry S. Truman who pointed to his desk and said:

This is where the buck stops.

Mr. Gordon echoed the words of Secretary of State Dean Rusk when he said:

Only the guy in the White House knows all the situation.

He then continued:

Never before in our history have the American people turned their back on the man in the White House. I am with the United States Government all the way, and President Johnson represents the Government and the people in his decisions. He is the only one who has access to all the information, and I know, as President, he is acting for the good of this country.

If the gentlemen of this House sometime feel as confused as I about the people who join in opposing the Nation's policies, imagine what the majority of Americans throughout the country feel when they read in the papers of a giant protest march in Washington. Not only did Mr. Gordon answer his Nation's call to duty, he has reared a family of three sons and six daughters, and all three sons have served in the armed services. Two sons answered the Nation's call in World War II and another served in Korea. Two of his sons were wounded in action. The

Gordons have 18 grandchildren and though they have the same love and feeling for these lovely children as any grandparents, they would be shocked if one of them refused to serve his country in time of need.

Mr. Gordon remembers his duty in France during World War I with nostalgia. He does not view it as a time of glory, but he remembers it with pride for he purchased a part of his American birthright with this active duty. He was one of four who went in the first draft from Madison County. Only two returned, and today he is the only survivor of that first group. He remembers that he served with the 80th Division, which was called into action three times in the Argonne front. He remembers his discharge on June 5, 1919. But what is most important is that he remembers and continues to feel the same toward his country as he did when he first answered the call to duty.

As I talked with Mr. and Mrs. Gordon I realized that freedom was truly a tangible thing. That it was almost something you could touch and see. That somewhere along the road since World War II we had failed to make all Americans see and feel that freedom was a very precious commodity, enjoyed by only a few million people as compared with the billions who inhabit the earth. But, like any precious commodity, it must be guarded, protected, fought for, and defended. This freedom was a many splended thing, but like a faith in God, it required a jealous devotion. Through misuse or abuse it could vanish. We preached freedom, but this preaching was taken up by those who would exploit its privilege without accepting the responsibility that went with the freedom. It was not a freedom that was guaranteed forever unless it was protected forever. We accepted the freedom that was handed down by our forefathers, but we failed to instill their high regard for this freedom. We degraded this gift by telling only of its advantages and nothing of the responsibilities inherent in our accepting it as a gift.

As a result, some of our people have accepted this freedom, interpreting it only as a right to disagree. There is also the responsibility of agreement. This Nation—this democracy—this Republic finds its strength in the people. There is a time for discussion, for disagreement, for compromise—but when the die is cast and the decision made, then we must rally behind our leaders.

I am sure that Mr. and Mrs. Gordon deplore the fact that American youths must fight, and some die, in Vietnam. They are not "for the war" just because it is a war.

They are for this Government and its President who leads it. They realize that the freedom which they enjoy along with 200 million other Americans is not dependent upon a group of people marching through our streets decrying the actions of war. They know this freedom is being protected along with the human rights of a small nation invaded by hostile Communist forces from the north.

I believe that Secretary of State Rusk clarified the situation in his recent press

conference, but perhaps that clarification should have been made a long time ago. Perhaps the real enemy to world peace and our own freedom should have been spelled out as Communist China many months back. Diplomacy is a necessity in world affairs, but it is also important that our own people be made aware of the imminence of the danger of any nation which would threaten the tranquillity of the world and the United States.

An editorial in the *Herald American*, an outstanding newspaper in my home district of Syracuse, commented aptly on Secretary Rusk's conference. It said:

The President and the experts around him obviously are the only ones who have all the information and know the full score on our foreign involvement. The sooner we get back to the American business of giving our patriotic support to them, the sooner we can expect just and honorable solutions.

Voicing some sentiments along this same line, Joseph A. Scerra, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States speaking at Redfield, S. Dak., on October 11 said:

It is high time some of the amateur diplomats, professional politicians, armchair generals and would-be Presidents in our Nation be reminded that their continuing harsh and distorted criticism of America's continuing stand against aggression in Vietnam is harmful to the success of our mission and to the security of our Nation. It may not be their intention, but these self-appointed experts of international military and political strategy are providing false hope and misleading comfort to the enemy. They—no less, and perhaps even more than the so-called anti-war demonstrators—are actually helping to prolong the war rather than to shorten it, as they so zealously claim is their objective.

Commander Scerra concluded his address with a plea to the lawmakers of this land. He said:

I therefore, personally call upon our Senators and Representatives to support the Administration in fulfilling its pledge to support our fighting men in Viet-Nam and to work for a just and honorable peace.

I feel that Commander Scerra has voiced the opinion of the great bulk of loyal Americans—and I know that representative of this feeling is James Gordon—who typifies the true spirit of Americanism.

I join these and other Americans who are concerned about our country. I hope that when James Gordon celebrates his 77th birthday Saturday that it will not only be a joyous occasion, but that he can look forward to a free America for which he fought—not only for himself but for his children and grandchildren.

President Kennedy stated the situation very clearly. He said:

The cost of freedom is always high but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission. The path to a just peace is the one where we present a united front to the enemy, so that he will not fail to recognize the futility of his aggressive course of action.

I call on the Members of this body, upon the Members of the Senate, upon all loyal Americans to unite behind the President as he leads us to victory and world peace where aggression will never be dared because it will be known that

America will join as one man to defeat the aggressor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the excellent statement he has made here today. His constituents have every right to be very proud of the manner in which he has presented our great commitment to Vietnam in its proper perspective, and in his call for support for the President and the boys in Vietnam.

When the full history of America's story is written, when the day comes when President Johnson is proven to be right in refusing to yield to expediency and to heed the counsel of those misguided people who do not understand the stakes involved in Vietnam; when the day of the full glory of our victory in Vietnam comes—yes—and when the full story of freedom's victory is written, the gentleman's words will take on new and penetrating meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague. I think he has performed a notable public service and it is my hope that every member of his constituency—yes, and every American may have the opportunity to read his remarks because he has placed in proper perspective the logical reason of why we must remain resolute in Vietnam.

I hope that there will be many, many more people to join him.

My own feeling is that the tide has turned in America. President Johnson has quietly and stubbornly stuck to his position defending the institutions of freedom in Vietnam. Finally, the world is beginning to realize what this brave man is doing. Our own country is beginning to realize better our aims, and I have every reason to believe that the various popularity polls which have become such an institution in our society will start reflecting a notable shift toward support of our President and the ideals that he is defending in Vietnam. It seems that all of a sudden the world is beginning to realize, as the President said the other day, that America is the first major power in the history of the world that has committed all of her strength and all of her resources and her reputation in defense of a small and helpless nation.

Last night I said at Catholic University:

When the United Nations were founded there were 51 nations. Today there are 127 nations. These are all small nations that have emerged in the last two decades out of colonialism and out of slavery and have now attained the dignity of free people.

These small nations all over the world are now beginning to see what this great President of ours is doing and what our soldiers in Vietnam are fighting for. They are not fighting for any territorial gains for America. They are fighting for a standard of human dignity for South Vietnam which has become infectious all over the world. When the small nations of the world finally realize the degree of our commitment to freedom, I'm sure these nations will become our most effective allies and the road to lasting peace shall have been carved by those brave Americans who gave their lives in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague for taking the time today to put all of this in proper perspective. He is right when he says that Mr. Gordon is the kind of American who reflects the real spirit of America.

The 30,000 to 40,000 misguided individuals who stormed the Pentagon last week do not reflect the real spirit of America.

I say to my colleague in the well that he has performed a notable service indeed. There will be more and more people who will understand and realize the true spirit of America that he has reflected here. I say that the people of this country indeed are going to answer his clarion call to support our President, because we are winning in Vietnam. More important, we are establishing a concept of unity, as the President said the other day, when the day will come that people all over this world will look back at what is happening in Vietnam today and say that this was the great turning point of man's struggle for freedom.

I have every reason to believe that when the war in Vietnam is concluded, as it will be, we are going to see a long era of peace and those who would destroy man's desire and ability to be free will have to take a back seat.

It has been a privilege to sit in this Chamber listening to my colleague, the gentleman from New York. In his very well-prepared speech, he has put our struggle for freedom, and the great devotion of our President to achieve that goal, in proper perspective.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the speech that he has made today.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for his kind remarks. The message that my colleague has conveyed in his remarks certainly add to the message that I have attempted to convey here today. I express my gratitude to you.

TOTAL FLUORIDE INGESTION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in recent months on the subject of fluoride. Today, I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Elise Jerard that gives a deep and authoritative insight on the subject. This article appeared in the *Journal of the Soil Association*, and is being reprinted in Australia and New Zealand. I commend my colleagues to read this article as they will find it extremely informative.

The article referred to follows:

TOTAL FLUORIDE INGESTION

(By Elise Jerard)

We are living in the Morning After the blind love affair with science-and-technology. It should be evident that Alfred North

Whitehead was right: "specialized thinking is thinking in a groove. The danger is that in our time specialized thinking has been mated with progress . . . while everywhere there is a weakened sense of direction . . . and relation." We race with time in urgent need of a relevant philosophy which, acknowledging the limits of science, establishes as our guiding principle the knowledge that all our truths are partial; and that we must consider all parts in their relation to the other parts involved; and the relation of the parts to the whole; which in turn is part of larger and larger wholes, so that awareness of the scope and intricacy humbles us to a protective caution.

With respect to the problem of environmental fluorides, the concept of a "fluoride deficiency" is quite illusory. There is more or less fluoride in soils, often augmented nowadays by phosphate and other fertilizers. There are fluorides in a number of pesticides, as well as in some pharmaceuticals, either as intentional ingredients or incidental, classified by researchers as "occult" fluoride. There is generally fluoride in the atmosphere, always to some extent in cities where there are massive combustions, and to excess where there is fluoride air pollution caused by industrial emissions. Some fifty industries contribute to such contamination, notably steel, aluminum, copper and zinc plants, brick, tile, ceramics and glass factories, refiners of oil and uranium, processors of phosphate fertilizers and some of the chemical industries.

It is rather rarely understood that airborne fluorides can enter the bodies of food plants grown in the vicinity of fluoride-emitting factories—but not necessarily in the immediate neighborhood. Leafy vegetables grown nine miles away from a steel mill in Fontana, California, contained 212 p.p.m. of fluoride. In the Bay Area, indeed, fluoride air pollution is measured by the effect upon fruit leaves. A test of apricot leaves in Santa Clara Valley in 1961 revealed, startlingly, that 532 p.p.m. of fluoride had been absorbed by the foliage. *Toxicology of Fluoride*, a volume emanating from an international conference of researchers in Berne, Switzerland, in 1964, lists among the more usual effects of airborne fluorides on American food plants: peaches up to 5 p.p.m. of fluoride; apples up to 4; carrots up to 5; spinach as much as 21; milk up to 2.3; celery leaves up to 135 p.p.m. The government's official figures for fluoride content of foods makes no allowance for such contamination.

Some plants can be damaged by as little as one part per billion of airborne fluoride. Substantial amounts can cause grave injuries. Recently spectacular damage to crops, livestock and human health were reported at Garrison, Montana, after the opening of a fluoride-emitting factory. A Congressional hearing was sought by citizens of Florida who suffered repeated damage to the citrus crop, around Tampa, in the vicinity of a fertilizer plant and other fluoride air-polluting industries. Animals were seriously fluorosed. Together with inhaled fluoride, deposits on pastures and contamination of the feed have caused intense suffering among the herds. Not only bones, joints, teeth and gums have been affected but, as revealed by autopsy, soft tissues of vital organs, including in some animals destined for human food.

Yet at a recent U.S. fluoridation hearing a doctor with the Public Health Service, who wished to fluoridate the water supply of a city in Santa Clara County which is exposed to fluoride air pollution from, among other sources, three brick and tile factories and an atomic energy plant, testified that these conditions were irrelevant because people "do not eat the atmosphere." His professional studies had omitted the fact that inhaled fluoride is conveyed to the bloodstream. Other witnesses who stated that fluoride has never been known to invade the soft tissues

of human beings were refuted by a study made in Provo, Utah, in which one of the witnesses participated.

FOOD FOR REFLECTION

Fluoride ingested with foods is a subject with many unknowns, although it is often discussed on a note of deceptive finality. Many foods, of course, naturally contain some fluoride. In a section of Samoa, where the water was fluoride-free and the atmosphere innocent of such contamination, tested persons consistently eliminated fluoride which could have derived only from food. Incidentally, the natives had excellent teeth until exposed to the diet of "developed" countries.

In our own diet, tea is high in fluoride content. Some coffees and wines contain quite large amounts. Many fish are fluoride-rich, as is most gelatin and other food items derived from bone. The sum of trace amounts in larger quantities of fluoride consumed naturally in foods varies, of course, with dietary patterns, both of individuals and cultures.

THE FLUORIDE CIRCUIT

In April, 1967, the International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances and the Diseases of Civilization published Resolution 39 which urges officials to refrain from fluoridating public drinking water supplies. Among the diverse reasons given was that "fluoridation sets up a fluoride circuit which affects fruits, vegetables and other consumables." Watering and irrigation are but two phases of this ill-probed problem.

Studies by McClure of the U.S. Public Health Service failed to take into consideration the changes in the fluoride content of food which must follow water fluoridation. Martin in 1951 showed that home cooking of vegetable products in fluoridated water increased their fluoride concentration. Cholak, in 1960, Krepkogorsky in 1963, and Waldbott in 1963 raised the question of total fluoride ingestion. Bratton, also Weir, demonstrated the effect of fluoridated water used in specific commercial food processes e.g. wet milling of corn and the preparation of yeast cultures. Inevitable fluctuations of the fluoride content in fluoridated water further complicate the problem. Concentration of fluoride is heightened by boiling and other heat and pressure processes.

THE SHARP INCREASE IN COMMERCIAL FOODS AND BEVERAGES

In the *Journal of Food Science*, the issue of Nov.-Dec., 1966, Marler and Rose of the Canadian Research Council published an arresting study which, like their previous study of the effects of fluoridating soft water, has not been followed by due research and caution.

The Marler-Rose study found that when commercial foods and beverages were prepared with fluoridated water the result was not only an increase of two to five-fold in fluoride content, but that healthy indoor workers in a temperate climate consumed from these sources 2 to 5 mg. a day. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration has repeatedly recommended 2 to 3 mg. at most for total fluoride intake. Krepkogorsky sets a similar limit. Accordingly, the amount consumed by individuals in the Marler-Rose study was in the admittedly toxic range.

As more and more cities and sections of the world are persuaded, pressured or compelled to fluoridate their water supplies, more and more processing plants will produce foods and beverages with an augmented fluoride content. Who will consume how much of these foods? What will it add up to? No one knows. Despite denials by fluoridation partisans, the medical literature has clearly established that some persons are allergic to fluoride, some tolerate it badly, many excrete inadequately a substance known to be toxic in low concentrations.

The Marier-Rose article concludes: "Our data suggest that some healthy individuals will ingest up to 5 mg. a day under normal indoor vocational occupations. Laborers exposed to outdoor summer conditions will undoubtedly ingest still more, as will individuals subject to chronic polydipsia (the abnormal thirst of illness.) (Adams and Jowsey, 1965; Sauerbrunn et al., 1965"; also Waldbott; Shea et al., 1967).

"A need is clearly indicated for more extensive data. The total fluoride intake of individuals in a fluoridated community should therefore be monitored and its medical significance carefully considered."

There is, to the best of our knowledge, no monitoring of fluoride in food and beverages; no more than there is suitable monitoring of airborne fluoride. Almost no hospitals have the equipment to evaluate fluoride toxicity. Instead, despite competent evidence, there is denial that any such problems exist.

ONE OF A NUMBER OF CONSEQUENCES OF THE FLUORIDE CIRCUIT

A nurse with a severe kidney ailment was treated by hemodialysis (washing with an artificial kidney) in the fluoridated city of Rochester. After each of 14 treatments her condition worsened; after the 14th dialysis bath she went into convulsions and expired. This case was reported, unprecedentedly, in two different medical journals by two separate teams of authors: the first was published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (184, 1963), the second in *Archives of Internal Medicine* (115, 1965.) Only a part of the facts appeared in each of these articles. In the *Journal of the American Medical Association* classic symptoms of fluoride poisoning were described, such as twitching, calcium changes and others, no mention, however, was made of the fluoridated water employed in these treatments. The report in *Archives of Internal Medicine* contained rather inconspicuous warning: "It would seem prudent to use nonfluoridated dialysis baths for long-term hemodialysis . . . the question of fluoride retention in patients with kidney disease has not been resolved." At autopsy, the nurse's vertebral bones contained 5500 p.p.m. of fluoride.

ANOTHER POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCE

A baby who died 16 hours after birth showed, on autopsy, besides abnormal calcium deposits in vital organs, an extraordinarily high fluoride concentration (the normal being zero) in the aorta, the lungs, the thymus gland, the kidneys and the heart. (*Journal of the American Medical Association*, 188, 1964.) In consultation, the physicians agreed that absorption of fluoride from the mother's system, through the placental barrier, must have been responsible for this fatal pathology.

Five cases, reported in *Rozhal-Chirurgie*, the Czechoslovakian medical journal described newborn babies with intestinal hemorrhages and high concentrations of fluoride, attributed to fetal absorption from mothers who had worked in fluoride air-polluting industries.

ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF TOTAL EXPOSURE

When the "permissible tolerance" for fluorides in water supplies was established by the U.S. Public Health Service at 1 p.p.m. and subsequently 1.2 p.p.m., industries were thereby assured that they could use the public waters for the disposal of their fluoride wastes, provided only that the rate of discharge did not exceed the legal limit.

With increased installations of devices for reduction of air pollution has come an increase in the quantities of fluoride wastes disposed of by other methods. The result has been more fluoride water pollution. The dimensions of this problem were suggested by Dr. Helen MacDonald, biologist, before the California Public Utilities Commission when

citizens of San Jose resisted an attempt to impose water fluoridation.

F. E. Gartrell describes in *Water Pollution Potential Of Air Pollution Control Devices* current processes for liquifying gaseous fluoride wastes in a phosphate plant at Orister, Florida. The liquid, retrieved by neoprene, rubber-lined scrubbers is treated so as to reduce the fluoride concentration to the legally permitted level, after which the wastes are metered into the Alafia River. People in this region draw water from the river, including, in some cases, drinking water.

Another example: the atomic energy plant at Fernold, Ohio, produces uranium and thorium metal. Hydrogen fluoride is employed in the process. Soluble fluorides are discharged into the Miami (Ohio) River at a level of 1.2 p.p.m. An average of 15,000 lbs. of fluorides per month has been thus liberated into this waterway. Downstream from Fernold, people use the water. The most obviously hazardous uses of such waters are for drinking, cooking, commercial processing of edibles, fishing for food and swimming.

The U.S. Steel Corporation plant at Provo, Utah, after \$9,000,000 worth of settlements of lawsuits, has developed a saner solution of this problem. Electrostatic devices recover about 90% of the fluoride, which is solidified, hauled off and buried with great care at a dry pit in a protected area. Such cautious fluoride graveyards may constitute a useful response to the environmental hazard of quantities of highly toxic fluoride by-products.

To date, however, the favored disposal measures of industries with fluoride wastes are twofold: to utilize the legal level for fluoride in water by discharging, at a controlled rate but persistently, vast amounts of residues into the public waterways; and, second, to sell quantities of fluoride by-products for fluoridation of supplies of drinking water.

REQUISITES

The fixed tendency to avert the eyes from a total environmental problem is a critical challenge of our time and of a societal system where control in the general human interest is weak and shortsighted special interests are strong.

Max Planck has observed that we need "Verstand"—grasp, understanding—and above all, that we need "Vernunft"—judgment, wisdom; which is not at all the same thing. Only a less limited "Verstand" and adequate guiding "Vernunft" can keep us from fouling our future and complexly committing suicide. The question is: Can we mobilize what it takes?

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing so much about cost reduction these days and, while I am certain that some agencies are more conscientious in this effort and others less, I would like to discuss one area which has come to my attention where "cost reduction" appears to be as meaningful and compelling as a phrase in a foreign tongue.

I am wondering whether anyone's attention has been drawn, as mine has been, to the apparent waste that goes on almost around the clock at—to echo its own proud boast, the largest printing

operation in the world—the Government Printing Office.

Recently I have heard disgruntled complaints from several avenues regarding the GPO operation.

At this moment, GPO is conducting a training seminar in editorial planning for about 165 editors, copyhandlers, and information people from various Federal Government agencies. By way of orientation the Public Printer has told them that GPO wants to give them the best service in the quickest possible time at the cheapest cost. That is an admirable objective, but let us look at the record.

I might point out here that the GPO state of affairs was brought to my attention by one agency, but I have since checked with other agencies and I find that the original agency's disappointment is not an isolated case.

It is a distasteful note that more and more of our Federal agencies seem to be shying away from the GPO for the simple reason that the service is "fifth rate." One or more of those purported "best, quickest, cheapest" constants in the GPO service formula too often become variables.

"Best" varies from flawless perfection to slipshod margins, off-register inkings, and glaring typos. "Quickest" varies with disturbing frequency from prompt service to extensions on extensions of delivery dates. And "cheapest" has increasingly been found to vary to mean "surcharge" or "overtime pay"—at 50 percent extra—to get the job done a day or two earlier than the extended delivery date.

It appears to be a fact of life that a GPO job for a smaller agency is often of mediocre quality, unless it is multicolored work for one of the larger agencies. But come the smaller agencies—with their correspondingly small appropriations—and GPO is said to be so overburdened with work that the powers-that-be send work out to field plants. Seeing the work from some of these plants, I cannot help but think it would be better to employ some of the junior high school printshops in my congressional district. The prize-winning publications produced by some of these schoolboy shops compare favorably with some of the field plant work I have seen. Without more than a moment's passing thought several junior and senior high schools in Pennsylvania school districts come to mind—Whitehall, Allen, Dieruff, Bethlehem, Catasauqua, Easton, and the Pocono Mountain schools. They and a number of others have won honors for their publications in professionally judged competitions in recent years and, I might add, deservedly.

In this climate of cost-consciousness in which we are working these days, too often when an agency editor or information officer seeks to get a printing job done in what he considers a reasonable time of, say, a month or two, he is urged by GPO people to authorize a surcharge to assure delivery within his deadline.

But I can assure you that paying a surcharge, or what I consider a penalty, will not get the work done very much sooner. And it certainly does not appear

to improve on the overall appearance of the product which carries the GPO tag. Complaints bring answers, but what kind? One complaint about the poor quality of a job, to my knowledge, brought the answer:

You know, we have a tough time getting competent help.

One very good answer, of course, would be to get the job done on a competitive bid by an "outside" shop but this action must first be approved at GPO in the plush silence of imposing offices far removed from desk pounding that goes on at the "customer" agencies over late deliveries from the largest publisher in the world.

I must say also that I view with no little awe two abilities of GPO—its seeming ability to put itself above the rules that bind other agencies and its apparent clairvoyance.

The seminars meeting at GPO now have been told that Members of Congress do not like to see pictures of agency heads in agency publications because this gives the appearance of an attempt at "personal aggrandizement" by the person pictured. In addition to that, the classes have been told, there is another good reason. In the event the person pictured should suddenly die, the publication would just as suddenly become obsolete.

However, one of the pieces of literature distributed at these seminars is a booklet on GPO operations containing a spate of personal pictures and biographical sketches of Printing Office officials. As a matter of fact there are two individual pictures each of the Public Printer, his deputy and his administrative assistant within six pages of each other. It appears that GPO is above the rules it applies to its customers and somehow knows that its booklet will not suddenly become obsolete.

There is one exception for pictures of agency heads, GPO representatives have explained. That is when the agency person's picture is one that has been taken "with the man over in the White House. You can't keep that out."

And, if I might digress a moment, inferences such as that are another sore point with me. I for one am tired of listening to inferences like this which would make the White House the scapegoat.

There is another side to the GPO coin—a very bright one. The Government Printing Office produces some outstanding work—work that is not matched anywhere else in the world. You have all seen these products; publications of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Defense, Agriculture, and other large agencies. They are paying a price for the service, of course—fast, quality service may rightly command premium praise—but there are no finer looking publications. Why, however, does that same quality not show up in the work done for agencies which are smaller but, proportionately, not lesser?

That much of GPO's work is without peer is only proof that it can do work of the highest quality routinely. Why then does it not?

BETHLEHEM VFW POST LAUNCHES MAIL-FROM-HOME PROJECT FOR AMERICAN SERVICEMEN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and happy to be able to announce today a project which is being conducted in my congressional district to support members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in Southeast Asia.

The project is a mail-from-home campaign which has been initiated by Bethlehem, Pa., Post 855, Veterans of Foreign Wars, to develop and maintain a steady flow of mail to all service men and women serving our country in Southeast Asia. Mail from home is the idea of Commander Wilbur F. H. Raidline, a man who has had a very successful past experience in boosting morale of American servicemen when, during the Korean war, he personally conducted a similar mail campaign which produced 35,000 letters and 560 packages for American forces in Korea.

Commander Raidline's new project has won endorsement of the Department of Defense and the White House, as his earlier project did in the 1950's. I personally wish him and VFW Post 855 every possible success because, in this small way, we as individual citizens can say "thanks" to the brave Americans who wear our Nation's military uniforms.

All Americans want our young men and women serving in Vietnam and in support capacities elsewhere in that region of the world to know that we at home do care and do appreciate what they are doing in defense of freedom and in quest of permanent peace.

Through newspapers published in Southeast Asia, Commander Raidline and VFW Post 855 will invite servicemen who would like to receive mail from home to send their complete mailing addresses and a brief description of themselves and their interests to Mail From Home, Bethlehem Post 855, VFW, Bethlehem, Pa. 18017.

At the same time, individuals across the country are invited to write letters and forward them along with postage to the Bethlehem VFW Post to be sent to individual servicemen overseas. Persons who wish to send packages may contact the Bethlehem VFW post by mail to receive the name and address of a serviceman who has requested a package.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of our Armed Forces who will spend the forthcoming holiday season many thousands of miles from home, I would like to invite all Americans to assist Commander Raidline and post 855 in this effort by writing warm, friendly letters from home. And I extend this same invitation to all of my colleagues in Congress as well as to the individual staff members of congressional offices and of-

fices of the executive and judicial branches.

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATIONS ISSUED BY ISRAEL'S CHIEF RABBI

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted into the RECORD a press account of an appeal to the conscience of humanity by Israel's chief rabbi on the subject of the persecution of Jewish minorities in Arab countries.

I now have a full text of that appeal, which I would like to place in the RECORD.

This statement provides compelling evidence of Arab cruelty. I might note that while independent observation confirms the barbarity of Arab treatment of Jewish minorities, independent observation also confirms that Israel has been treating its Arab minority with kindness, decency, and respect. This statement points up the ludicrousness of Arab complaints of Israel injustice.

I urge my colleagues to read this statement, to judge for themselves which side in the current conflict in the Middle East has conducted itself in a civilized manner:

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE NATIONS ISSUED BY ISRAEL'S CHIEF RABBI

With the onset of the High Holy Days in this year of destiny for the House of Israel, we, the Chief Rabbis of the State of Israel, appeal with all earnestness to the conscience of the Nations to act vigorously and without delay to alleviate the plight of thousands of innocent Jews against whom the governments of some Arab states have vented their anger and wrought their vengeance after failing in their aggressive design to extinguish the reborn Jewish State.

While the attention of the world has been focused so intently on the political problems besetting our region, and the clamor of Arab slander against Israel mounts in intensity, supported by the unprincipled policy of certain other governments, the plight of the Jewish communities in several of the Arab states where a reign of black terror has been unleashed against them, approaches total catastrophe.

Hundreds of Jews are being subjected to daily torture, beatings and humiliations, while imprisoned in inhuman conditions and indeed in some cases in the custody of Nazis who have found haven and hospitality in Egypt.

All this is being done by several Arab governments to their Jewish citizens and residents as well as stateless Jews, absolutely innocent of any action hostile to the state, only because they are Jews, and as such defenseless, held political hostage, and the victims of the Arabs' thwarted grand design to annihilate the State of Israel.

Attempts by international and humanitarian bodies have met with stubborn refusal on the part of Egypt, Syria and Iraq to discuss the plight of their Jewish communities, and all humanitarian approaches to rescue these communities from the inhuman totalitarian oppression they are undergoing have

been rudely rejected by the Arab governments concerned.

In Egypt, which has committed the bestial obscenity of using Nazi gaolers camouflaged with Egyptian names, for Jewish prisoners—an act deeply repugnant to civilized humanity in the light of recent history—the property of the Jews of Cairo has been confiscated, harsh restrictions are imposed against those Jews not held in unspeakably grim prisons, those imprisoned have been beaten, their hands and ribs broken, their hair shaven, their eye-brows pulled out; they have been denied food and water for long hours. When water has been provided, it has been in minute quantities and crude methods. The Chief Rabbi of Alexandria is in prison, the Chief Rabbi of Cairo is under house arrest as is the president of the Ashkenazi Jewish Community in the Egyptian capital, and those few Jews expelled from Egypt after imprisonment have been deprived of all their possessions and belongings.

In Syria, which has never treated its Jewish minority humanely, the Jews live in ghetto conditions, suffering persecutions, endless extortions; Jewish quarters have been attacked by mobs, curfews have been imposed, Jewish ghettos are threatened with starvation, all the Jewish teachers were expelled from schools and were replaced by Moslem teachers. In Damascus Jews were thrown out of their homes which were given to Palestinians. The public is instructed not to buy from Jews.

In Iraq, unbridled incitement against the Jews abounds in the government press, radio and television. Jewish business has been prohibited, dozens of Jews arrested on trumped-up charges of "spying for Israel", police and other government personnel have extorted money from Jews. The secret police have begun, lately, to threaten the Jews with murder and expropriation. A Jewish girl was arrested, put into gaol with criminals and only freed after she had been raped.

In Egypt, Syria and Iraq, the Jews have suffered intensely since the tension started in this area early this year sustaining severe losses in life, liberty and property, as a result of direct governmental responsibility for their persecution. Almost all the Jewish men in Egypt have been imprisoned, including those seriously ill from heart and other ailments. Synagogues have been seized, prayers proscribed. Iraqi legislation against Jews has been rigidly enforced, professions have been closed to Jews in that country, the government refuses to issue passports to Jews wishing to leave.

This shocking catalogue of crimes by Arab governments against their helpless Jewish minorities has been largely overlooked in recent months by public opinion in the enlightened world.

The attempts made by international agencies to halt or at least modify the reign of terror have been ineffectual and contemptuously rebuffed by the Arab governments concerned.

We therefore direct this passionate appeal from Jerusalem, the sacred shrine of Judaism and the focus of intense religious feeling for the great religions, to the conscience of all mankind to raise its voice and demand instant action to stamp out this inhuman, cruel and uncivilized wave of oppression directed against our people by governments which give lip service to the United Nations Charter.

May the Rock of Israel in His infinite wisdom and mercy bring about the salvation of the hostages of Israel as the Book of Judgment is once more opened to weigh right and wrong in these High Holy Days.

NEW YORK POLL SHOWS THE REAL STRENGTH OF L. B. J.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

New York [Mr. FARSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, some Republicans are spreading the word that Lyndon Johnson will be easy to beat in 1968.

We know the Republicans are experts at whistling in the dark. And few Democrats are taking them seriously. For while the President's popularity is down a year before the election, much can happen to alter the trend of the popularity polls.

I would also remind the Republicans of a less-publicized, but significant fact: A poll conducted by a Princeton firm shows the President winning decisively against every Republican candidate put against him.

Commenting on this poll, Roscoe Drummond writes:

While the decisiveness of LBJ's lead in New York State runs counter to those who take his defeat next year almost for granted, it supports others who believe that, when the test is at hand, the odds will favor the President.

The poll shows President Johnson running ahead of Nixon, Romney, Reagan, and Senator PERCY by margins of 22 to 27 percent.

He beats them all in traditionally Republican upstate New York by 9 to 13 percent; and he demolishes them in New York City by 36 percent.

Mr. Drummond notes that the poll was conducted by a veteran and highly respected polltaker.

I have consulted with an expert student of polls—

He writes—

and his judgment is that the questions were properly framed.

What does this poll mean?

It means that Republican talk notwithstanding, Lyndon B. Johnson will be a tough candidate to beat in 1968. The difficulty the Republicans face is that they are up against a President who has compiled an unprecedented record of achievement for the American people.

And as New York is going—so will go the Nation.

I insert into the RECORD Roscoe Drummond's article appearing in the Wichita Eagle:

IS JOHNSON DOWN OR UP?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Is LBJ down or up?

A series of Gallup and Harris nationwide surveys shows President Johnson massively unpopular.

But an in-depth New York state poll shows President Johnson massively popular.

The fact that a political opinion survey runs sharply counter to the mainstream of polling is no reason it can be safely dismissed.

When the polls show opposite results, it is a little unsettling. Consider this:

Nationwide Gallup and Harris polls show Romney and Rockefeller, when pitted against Johnson in trial heats, each winning by a few percentage points.

But in New York state a poll just completed by Political Surveys and Analyses, Inc. of Princeton, shows the President winning decisively against every Republican candidate put against him.

The margin of LBJ's political ascendancy in New York state can hardly be overemphasized.

He runs ahead of Nixon, Romney, Reagan, and Percy by a range of 22 to 27 per cent.

He leads them all in substantially conservative, traditionally Republican upstate New York by a range of 9 to 13 per cent.

He crushes his Republican opponents in New York City by 36 per cent.

Against Nixon, who does better in this New York poll than the other Republicans, Johnson takes 70 per cent of the Negro vote, 81 per cent of the Jewish vote, and a substantial majority of the Catholic and Protestant vote.

The President takes 25 per cent of the Republican vote while Nixon wins only 12 per cent of the Democratic vote. He leads comfortably among independents.

Here are the precise figures on how Johnson does against four GOP opponents in New York state:

Candidates:	Percent
Nixon -----	31
Johnson -----	53
Percy -----	28
Johnson -----	51
Reagan -----	29
Johnson -----	56
Romney -----	30
Johnson -----	52

(The average undecided vote was 14 per cent. The average vote for other candidates, 3½ per cent. Rockefeller's name was not polled.)

Was this a competent survey? There is no evidence to the contrary. It was supervised by Archibald Crossley, a veteran polltaker and widely respected as both professional and objective. I have consulted with an expert student of polls and his judgment is that the questions were properly framed.

It is on the unexpectedly large Johnson lead that the Crossley poll conflicts with the national results of the Gallup and Harris polls. Romney is the only Republican in the Crossley poll who has run ahead of Johnson in a nationwide Gallup poll. Nixon, Reagan, and Percy have never led the President in any nationwide trial heat.

While the decisiveness of LBJ's lead in New York state runs counter to those who take his defeat next year almost for granted, it supports others who believe that, when the test is at hand next fall, the odds will favor the President.

MRS. BOLTON PRAISES THE JOB CORPS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fight over the war on poverty which is looming before the House will, obviously, be a bitter and difficult one. One of the few satisfactions the Nation can take from this struggle is that it has transcended purely partisan boundaries. Both the friends and the foes of the war on poverty can be found on both sides of the aisle, and the desire to do what is best for the Nation will, I am confident, overcome the natural desire to do what is best for a Member's own party.

The able gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] recently visited a woman

Job Corps center in Cleveland, and came away with the kind of straightforward and penetrating analysis which her colleagues, Republican and Democratic, have learned to expect from the ranking lady of the House.

The Cleveland Congresswoman—

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer—

advocated Job Corps tours for Congressional critics of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I insert newspaper articles from the September 8 editions of the Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press, describing Mrs. BOLTON's tour and her comments, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 8, 1967]

CONGRESSWOMAN BOLTON LAUDS GIRLS' CENTER HERE

Cong. Frances Bolton (R-Cleveland) said a tour of the Women's Job Corps Center here has won her enthusiastic approval of the program regarded as the most costly and most criticized of national anti-poverty efforts.

The center at 1588 Ansel Rd. has an enrollment of about 330 girls and has cost about \$2,500,000 a year to operate in addition to about \$300,000 in cash allowances for the trainees. This amounts to about \$8000 a year for each trainee.

But Cong. Bolton said these costs are justified by the success of the center and urged that more money be provided for the program.

"This is the essence of what Americans want to do to help people," she said of the center where girls from poverty families live while they receive schooling and job training.

Mrs. Bolton added that she feels Congress was wrong in restricting the policy by which girls and youths are flown to and from centers far from their homes for this training. The center here has girls from Hawaii, California, Texas, Alabama, New York and other states.

Having trainees from all parts of the nation living together is a way of helping to build America, she said.

Dr. Zelma George, the center director who was highly praised by Cong. Bolton, contended that there is less temptation for trainees to drop out of the program when they are remote from their homes.

An aide said that more than 75% of the center's graduates are being placed in jobs.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Sept. 8, 1967]

REPRESENTATIVE BOLTON TOURS FACILITY: CITY JOB CORPS CENTER PRAISED

(By Alma Kaufman)

Rep. Frances P. Bolton, R-22, had high praise for the Cleveland Job Corps for Women after spending yesterday there and said Job Corps should get a larger share of antipoverty money.

"This was one of the most wonderful days I ever had," said Mrs. Bolton.

"You see Hawaii living with Texas . . . Washington with Alabama; you get the sense that this is the way we're building America as we can't build it any other way."

The Cleveland congresswoman advocated Job Corps tours for congressional critics of the program.

"I know that what I needed was to come here and spend the day," she said. "My sense of the Job Corps is very different from what it was yesterday."

Mrs. Bolton said the program should have enough money to provide job security for center staffs and continuity of service. At present, centers are funded for a year at a time and employees cannot be hired for a

longer period. The people of Cleveland should make some provision for continuity, Mrs. Bolton said.

She also said the Cleveland center should be moved from Ansel Road to a better location, but probably not into the suburbs.

"Young people should be within walking distance of recreation," she explained. "They tell us we're all going to be urbanites very soon, so we should be ready."

Mrs. Bolton praised the center director, Dr. Zelma George, as the person responsible for its good impression.

"A short time ago this was a disgraceful place."

PEACENIKS' SHOW IS A FLOP

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world were alerted to the demonstration in Washington this past weekend by our news media, both before and after the event. While this demonstration is now complete—we can now draw our own conclusions as to the real effectiveness of this event when we compare it to the numerous cities that had millions of Americans display the support which our Nation has in fulfilling our commitment in Vietnam.

I would like to call attention to an appropriate editorial which appeared in the Evening News, Perth Amboy, N.J., presenting an analysis of this past weekend. This distinguished newspaper, in the opinion of the people in the field of journalism, is outstanding in its coverage of national and international news. Only recently, the editor, Mr. Kenneth W. Michael, made a tour of the Mideast and wrote a series of articles on his observations.

The demonstrations held in my district this past weekend clearly indicate that patriotism is not dead.

PEACENIKS' SHOW IS A FLOP

The numbers game of how many peaceniks demonstrated in Washington over the weekend goes on but no matter whether the figure is 50,000 or 150,000—as claimed by some—the fact is that untold thousands more supported rallies in favor of the United States commitment in Vietnam and its fighting forces.

Over 400 so-called peaceful demonstrators in the capital got out of hand and had to be arrested. There was brief success in one attempt to enter the Pentagon but the half-dozen intruders were carried out.

On any basis of comparison, the anti-war demonstration was a flop. It was, instead, a sad spectacle.

One of the more sickening aspects of the rally was Dr. Benjamin Spock's description of the President of the United States as the "enemy."

Typical of the shocking attitudes of the vocal minority was one of the signs on display: "LBJ the Butcher."

Contrasted with the antics of the peaceniks, far-leftists, Communist sympathizers and scores of hippies out on the town, were the many parades in "Support of Our Boys in Vietnam."

Charles W. Wiley of Sayreville, national chairman of the National Committee for Re-

sponsible Patriotism, said the loyalty marches were "the real protest movement in America."

Millions of Americans subscribe to Wiley's observation that, "The overwhelming majority of the American people showed with dignity in quiet vigil or in massive parades throughout the country that they were disgusted with lawlessness and with those who are dishonoring our nation, and they have quietly said 'Stop it, we've had enough.'"

HOUSE OUT OF CONTROL

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues to whom it may be appropriate, that the subsequent editorial of the New York Times appears to indicate that a self-analysis and accounting is in order pursuant to the past statements that were made at the commencement of this session of Congress.

HOUSE OUT OF CONTROL

What ever happened to the so-called new breed of responsible, constructive, modern-minded Republicans in the House? Representative Ford of Michigan, the minority leader, and his colleagues started off the year bravely enough, presenting their alternative proposals to those contained in the State of the Union message and assuring everyone that the obstructionist alliance with the Southern Democrats was a thing of the past.

In recent weeks, however, negativism and arid partisanship have prevailed. Responsible legislators in both parties know perfectly well that no budget can be reduced by picking a figure out of the air and arbitrarily asserting that total spending is to be cut by that amount. A budget is an expression of programs that Congress has already established. The only useful approach is to analyze those programs, one by one, and decide which of them can be reduced, postponed or eliminated.

Such decisions can be debated on their merits and in a factual framework. The same cannot be said for the rider which Republicans and Southern Democrats joined in attaching to the routine resolution extending the spending authority of those departments whose money bills have not yet been approved. It may sound good to say that the House has ordered the Administration to slash spending by \$8 billion, but everyone who understands budgeting knows that this is just playing to the gallery.

If the resolution was demagogic, the adamant opposition among House Republicans to rent subsidies and model cities expresses a disquieting refusal to think through urban needs and to act upon them. The meager compromise patched up yesterday by House-Senate conferees will, if approved, permit these two programs to go limping forward, but it underscores the rural-and-suburban bias of most House Republicans, who are only too eager to turn their back upon the cities.

Not all of the irresponsibility is confined to the House or to the G.O.P. But the significant development in Congress is a House of Representatives out of control. In feeble but shortsighted partisanship, most House Republicans have joined with the reactionary backwoodsmen among the Southern Democrats and are rampaging against any and all domestic programs. Before rushing any fur-

ther in this direction, Representative Ford and other House Republican leaders need to remember their predecessors who followed that same dead-end street and met with repudiation from the voters.

CONTINUATION OF GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program has been in effect since November 8, 1965, when President Johnson signed it into law. In the first full fiscal year of its operation, 392,000 students have received loans totaling more than \$247 million.

This unique program is an example of creative federalism carried to its widest meaning. It brings together a diversity of institutions in our economy: from our private citizens to our universities, from our banking and credit institutions to the State and Federal Governments.

Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program is now under consideration. I feel it constitutes a necessary element in our total program of financial aid to the students in this country. With the constantly increasing costs of higher education, it is not only the lower income family which cannot afford to send its child to school, but also the middle-income parents.

From costs of \$1,230 per year in a public institution and \$1,760 in a private school in 1957, these costs have risen to \$1,600 in the former and \$2,500 in the latter. It is estimated that by 1972-73 these costs will have risen still further to \$1,940 and \$2,940, a rise of 18 and 14 percent respectively over the 1966-67 figures. This means that approximately 20 percent of a family's income—if it falls between \$10,000 and \$15,000—would be needed to pay for 1 year of a child's education. When one considers that many families have more than one child in college at the same time, it could become a question of from 40 to 60 percent.

This is the only program for which the middle-income child is eligible. All others have a need restriction which their families cannot meet. Yet these students may well be "needy" too in the sense that their parents cannot provide such a large part of their yearly income for one expense.

The guaranteed student loan program makes it possible for the student to borrow up to \$1,000 per year as an undergraduate or vocational student and \$1,500 as a graduate to help meet his expenses. On this money he need pay no interest for the period of time that he is in school nor, if we enact one of the proposed amendments, during any period he may serve in a service organization such as the military, VISTA, or the Peace Corps if his family income is under \$15,000. Thus, he is freed from the financial burden while in school. When he does begin paying the loan back,

he need pay only 3-percent interest on the balance, the Federal Government paying the remaining interest. Thus, the money is of low cost to him.

It is estimated by the Office of Education that by 1972, 2.2 million students will be taking advantage of this program. This means that approximately that many students will be in college who might otherwise not be there. We, as a nation, have recognized that education is a good investment. No other has the promise of as great returns, not only to the individual, but also to our society as a whole. It means increased productivity on the part of the individual, better services to the public, and a more informed populace, better able to cope with the increasing complexity of the world.

SOVIETS STRENGTHEN NAVY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take specific note of the fact that one of the salaries that will be paid out of the military pay bill before us, today, is that of one of our most distinguished Americans, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, U.S. Navy. Every Member of the Congress knows the outstanding job Admiral Rickover is doing as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program. We are reminded of the importance of this program every day. Just this morning, the Washington Post carried an article on the expansion of the Soviet Navy which cites the growing force of Soviet nuclear submarines.

I think all of you know that the U.S. fleet of 41 nuclear-powered Polaris missile-firing submarines is our Nation's greatest deterrent to nuclear war. Our nuclear-powered attack submarines provide one of the best weapons to counter the Soviet submarine threat discussed in the Post this morning.

Our nuclear-powered surface warships have proved their mettle by establishing record after record in the war in Vietnam.

I congratulate the executive branch for, again, reappointing Admiral Rickover to continue in his present job as head of the naval nuclear propulsion program, at least until 1970.

I will insert the Post article I refer to in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 26, 1967]
SOVIETS STRENGTHEN NAVY—FLEET OF NUCLEAR SUBMARINES, MISSILE CRAFT NOTED IN NEW EDITION OF JANE'S FIGHTING SHIPS

LONDON, October 25.—The Soviet navy has increased its nuclear submarine strength, is stepping up production of missile-carrying warships and is thinking of building its first aircraft carrier, the 70th annual edition of Jane's Fighting Ships reported today.

A table in the 1967-1968 edition of Jane's, the standard reference book on the world's navies, showed that the Soviet Union now has 50 nuclear submarines and 350 other

subs, compared with 80 nuclear submarines and 127 others in the U.S. Navy.

Raymond V. B. Blackman, editor of the authoritative publication for the past 19 years, noted in a foreword to the new edition that the Soviets have greatly strengthened their submarine fleet in recent years by retiring obsolescent craft and adding new, rocket-firing submarines. He said some of the nuclear submarines carry six missile launchers, and the latest ones carry eight.

DETAILS OF DESTROYER

Blackman gave details of the new, Kresta-class guided-missile destroyers being built by the Soviet navy. The first of the 6000-ton ships—equipped with twin launchers for surface missiles, launchers for antiaircraft missiles, plus torpedo tubes, four 57-mm guns and a helicopter—made its sea trials early this year. Blackman said more of the fast, versatile ships are soon to follow.

"It is evident that the Soviet navy will for years to come be a force to be reckoned with, deployed on a worldwide scale, on the move as never before, and capable of exerting a strong maritime influence on universal affairs," he wrote.

Interest in missile-carrying warships has been heightened since Israel claimed that Soviet missiles were used by an Egyptian naval craft last Saturday to sink the destroyer *Ellat* off the Sinai coast. Israeli officials said the attack was launched from a Soviet-built, Komar-class missile patrol boat in Port Said's harbor.

FIFTY-FOUR CARRIERS

Present emphasis in the U.S. Navy is on aircraft carriers headed by the 85,000-ton nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, Jane's Fighting Ships reported, with three more carriers of this class under construction or scheduled to be built.

It said the U.S. Navy's target of 15 super-carriers may be increased to 17. The United States presently has 34 large aircraft carriers plus 20 "baby flattops" for escort, helicopter and assault duty, Jane's said.

[The commanders of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes and Vice Adm. William E. Ellis said last Sunday that the Soviets are building an initial aircraft carrier that will be relatively small, but with long-range cruising capabilities.]

The publication also reported the U.S. Navy is planning what could be classed as an amphibious capital ship, a vessel of about 40,000 tons which would combine the duties of a helicopter carrier and a ship for carrying assault troops.

The new edition also took note of Britain's growing nuclear-powered submarine fleet, armed with Polaris missiles, and the development by France of nuclear submarines equipped with missiles. The first of these French submarines, *Le Redoutable*, has already been launched.

JAPAN TOPS WORLD IN BUILDING SHIPS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, to further point up how our great Nation has slipped in the shipbuilding world, I commend to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the October 25 edition of the Washington Evening Star under dateline "London AP." The article reported on shipbuilding through-

out the world and the United States did not even receive honorable mention.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

JAPAN TOPS WORLD IN BUILDING SHIPS

LONDON (AP).—Japan heads the world's shipbuilders with a greater tonnage under construction than the next four countries put together, Lloyd's reported today.

World shipbuilding orders continue on an upward trend, said Lloyd's register of shipbuilding returns for the quarter ended Sept. 30.

Orders total another record figure of 39,550,636 tons, which is 4,203,383 tons more than the previous quarter. "Almost every country shows an increase in its order book," said Lloyd's.

Japan leads in percentage of world tonnage of merchant ships under construction with 401 ships, 4,240,161 tons gross—31.65 per cent of the total.

Then come:

Britain, 137 ships, 1,339,364 tons gross—10 percent. West Germany, 141 ships, 1,012,862 tons gross—7.56 percent. Sweden, 44 ships, 771,884 tons gross—5.76 percent. Italy, 95 ships, 755,865 tons gross—5.64 percent. France, 40 ships, 687,569 tons gross—5.13 percent.

On order at the end of September this year British industry had 1967 ships of 1,682,000 tons gross with an estimated value of \$624.4 million (excluding naval work).

The total order book at the end of September 1966, covered 318 ships, of 2,592,000 gross tons.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION ADDRESS—LORAS COLLEGE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I had the honor to participate in ceremonies in Dubuque inaugurating the Right Reverend Monsignor Justin A. Driscoll the 19th president of Loras College, the oldest college in Iowa.

Since its founding in 1839, Loras has become known and respected in church and academic circles alike as an outstanding institution for the education of young men in the liberal arts.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with Monsignor Driscoll over the past 3 years, in his capacity as archdiocesan superintendent of schools, and I have the greatest admiration for him as priest, educator, and administrator.

He brings to Loras courage and imagination, a strong commitment to educational excellence, and broad experience not only in the Catholic schools, but in the development of communication and mutually beneficial relationships between public and private schools as well.

I am confident that under his direction Loras will continue the proud record so ably advanced by his immediate predecessor, Msgr. Dorance D. Foley, and will add new dimensions of leadership in education in our State and the Midwest.

In his inaugural address, Monsignor Driscoll cited the vital role of the private college and emphasized the need for de-

veloping sound methods of assisting and encouraging such schools, in the interests of maintaining the diversity which is the genius of our educational system.

I think that Monsignor Driscoll's remarks are particularly relevant to our task in the Congress of determining the appropriate role of the Federal Government in the field of education.

I would therefore like to bring his inaugural address to the attention of my colleagues in the House, include it at this point in the RECORD:

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION ADDRESS—LORAS COLLEGE

(By Rt. Rev. Msgr. Justin A. Driscoll, Ph. D., Oct. 20, 1967)

Your Excellencies, distinguished members of the Board of Regents of Loras College; candidates for the honorary degrees of Loras College; representatives of the colleges and universities; superintendents of schools, local, State and National; representatives of local, State, and Federal governments; members of the faculty, student body, and employees of Loras College; my family, relatives, and friends.

In recent years the college president has been variously regarded. To many students, the president is a kind of invisible man; to the faculty he is a source of constant threat. To the academic world, he is a patient hovering between life and death, sustained only by the props of the public relations office, the business and endowment office, and the Board of Regents. To the general public he is a figure that appears in glory at every after-dinner introduction which pays little attention to truth.¹

Yet, he finds himself alone each morning before his God as he rises to say his prayers and is reminded of the words of the Book of Sirach: "Blessed is the man who is found blameless and who does not go after gold (Sirach 31:8)." But the college president does have an important task. He is the leader of an academic community seeking Truth.

The fundamental rationale of a Catholic College is the "discovery, transmission, and synthesis of truth." Its primary commitment is to truth.

Today in an academic and religious setting we formalize the beginning of the task of being the 19th president of Loras College in its search for truth, but not a search behind the paper walls of impersonality. Rather, a search with a concern for man and a realistic love of persons, regardless of race, color, or creed.

With gratitude I thank my associates of the colleges and universities for coming; also my good friends, the Catholic Superintendents with whom I have worked these many years; especially the Bishops, religious, and educational, professional, business, and labor representatives; my relatives and friends; the students, faculty, and employees of this institution: all of you who have honored Iowa's first college by your presence. I am deeply grateful for your coming this day.

In addition, I wish to express a very sincere word of thanks, in my own name and for the entire community of Loras, to my predecessor, Monsignor Dorance V. Foley, for all he did to advance this institution. Likewise, the name of Mr. Harry W. Wahlert, our great benefactor and friend, cannot go unmentioned.

Many people tell us today that we are in an age of crisis.

The crisis of war: How much blood may a human being shed for justice' sake?

¹ Cf. William C. McInnes, S.J. "The Religious University in a Pluralistic Society," *Presidential Address, Fairfield University, October 24, 1964.*

The crisis of race: Where dare a human being draw the color line?

The crisis of sex: What may two human beings do in the name of love?

The crisis of poverty: How long must two fifths of the world go hungry?

The crisis of religion: At what point does worship become heresy or idolatry?²

These are vital issues indeed. But at this moment in history there is a concern more crucial and more basic than any of these. The most critical issue of all is not bombs, not skin, not morals, not food, not even the church. It is the crisis of God. How does the man of today touch his God? How does God touch him?³

It seems appropriate then, to explore the contributions of a religiously committed college in a pluralistic society.

It is my thesis this morning that colleges like Loras have a unique contribution to make to modern society: to the welfare of this state, this nation, and to all mankind. This is done:

By exercising man's highest faculty, his intellect; and

By extending the horizons of learning in the pursuit of truth.

Such schools as Loras are not anachronisms. They are special assets, and we should encourage their presence. And it is the primary duty of the president, I believe, to lead such an institution toward that fulfillment.

A religiously committed college does not stunt man's growth, nor blind his vision. On the contrary, such a college expands growth and vision:

By widening the base of learning;

By strengthening man to face the moral crisis of his time;

By probing the depths of man's commitment that lie beneath all denominational or secular allegiance.

Loras College has a commitment to its faith. This it can neither deny nor evade. But faith does not destroy truth; it reveals it. Faith does not lower learning; it opens it to new possibilities. It directs man's mind to the world of God as well as to the world of man.

It is a serious responsibility of such an institution to illumine and reaffirm the great God-created values of man: the ideals of truth and beauty, freedom and justice, mercy and love, the centrality of the spiritual life. This college must ever interpret to her students, as no institution can, the meaning of sin, suffering, destructive hate, and redemptive love.

The exclusion of such values in education, in my judgment, is fatal. Is not all education at once an intellectual, moral, and sacred enterprise? Is not every effort to fulfill the individual a sanctified or sacred effort as well as a humane one? Are not the words of the *Pastoral Constitution on The Church in the Modern World* applicable: "Whoever follows Christ, the perfect man, becomes himself more a man." (n. 41)?

And here I emphasize that I am not unmindful of the obvious issue of separation of Church and State. I firmly believe in that principle. But in the words of the distinguished president of St. Olaf's College, Northfield, Dr. Sidney A. Rand, while I believe in "institutional separation of Church and State," I likewise believe in "operational interaction of these two institutions." This outlook was the prevailing view of the Congress of the United States in passing the Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education Acts. And I believe the passage of these acts has gone a long way to prevent what Dr. Rand calls the "growth of a new religion (the religion of the state) as the chief fact of life," or on the other hand [of allowing] the as-

² Walter J. Burghardt, S.J. "The Future of Theology," *Guide, August-September 1967.*

³ *Ibidem.*

sumption that all religion is unimportant and should fade from prominence in public life. "In either case," he concludes, "it could be said that anything like the traditional debate about Church-State relationships is passe and better forgotten."

We need diversity in education, whether it be at the elementary, secondary, or higher levels. Diversity has made this nation great. We see it everywhere around us: in the dress people wear, in the hair styles they keep, in the political parties they promote (here on the state), in the life of students and faculty themselves. Certainly, we need diversity and freedom in educational organization if we are to maintain the liberties and values of this nation. For by way of contrast we see what has happened in Iron Curtain countries of the Soviet Union and East Germany. To look for a nonpublic school in either nation is to invite suspicion or amusement.

But diversity is a value in education only if different schools exist and flourish, only if they are encouraged and assisted. When a church-related college is hampered or is closed for financial reasons, there is real danger of the loss of diversity.

People of diverse educational backgrounds have worked together to make strong our America; and today I most earnestly invite the leaders of public and nonpublic education to engage in more discussion and dialogue on these problems, to be open and to probe every aspect of the issue. I suggest we give serious consideration to the 1967 recommendations of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, when it proposed that: Universities and educational associations should sponsor symposiums to explore the advantages, appropriate procedures, and possible pitfalls of establishing educational competition.

The distinguished U.S. Chamber of Commerce also recommended that: Local, state and federal governments should consider legislation which would enable communities to adopt programs establishing a public-private option for all children.⁴

The twenty-four non-state colleges of Iowa had an enrollment last year of approximately 38,000 students as compared to 40,000 enrolled in the three state colleges.

I submit that Iowa will be a greater state if somehow it finds the way to assist the students of these twenty-four colleges, in twenty-four different communities they serve, than if it continues to ignore them and make it economically and educationally impossible for the students to attend these institutions.

The graduates of these schools have assisted mightily toward the building up of this state, and just as the federal government has found the way to assist the students of these institutions, I maintain that the people of Iowa, through their legislators, should also be assisting them in a similar manner.

A society can expect acceptable behavior from neither youth nor adults if morals and ultimate values are not somehow linked to the educational process. College personnel know all too well "that knowledge is power and that all power carries a fuse for explosion."

A religiously committed college although not guaranteeing responsible student behavior, offers an insight into the basic grounds of responsibility. A religiously dedicated institution, for example, should be able to reply forthrightly to the nine o'clock rally that is heralded by the shrill cry: "We want booze!"

What Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard Professor of the Humanities, said on the

occasion of the inauguration of the president of Wellesley College is particularly applicable to religiously oriented colleges:

"The college should be in the world but not of it. It is a vantage point, not a billboard, a house of intellect through whose wide windows the turmoil and the violence of even this violent age can be appraised on principles more lasting than the shifting passions of the hour."

Admission [to college] is a privilege to be granted, not a right to be demanded.⁵

This does not imply a lessening of the student's rights. Rather, it means that the admitted student acquires new rights and new responsibilities.

His principal right, says Professor Jones, is that he be treated gravely. "To maintain the college as a fortress against anarchy to keep it a place where the great tradition of learning can be glimpsed and in some sense mastered even by beginners—this is the high and difficult task of a college president in a world of propaganda and polemic."⁶

The president knows it is difficult to motivate students today. They often shun commitment. They play it "cool." We dare not ask them to give up a meal, least of all, a weekend. Yet, they do respond to ideals they grasp, and they will dedicate themselves to causes in which they can become involved.

I realize that students cannot be forced to be divine; they cannot even be forced to be human. But they must be both. The college, though not a church, must open new paths to God and man. A religiously oriented college in no way supplants a church. But it does afford a new opportunity to express basic love and commitment through theological reflection.

It is prayer and reflection that makes students human and leads them to the divine. Reflection extends the students far beyond themselves, and a singular work of Loras College is to engage the students in reflection on the meaning of history: to summon them to search for the meaning of the events in which they are engaged; in brief, to find new depths to their existence.

In face of such responsibility and mystique, the inauguration of a president of this renowned college becomes a community celebration and not a coronation.

We celebrate the extension of God rather than the pretension of man. We have no pride, only gratitude to God. We dedicate ourselves in the motto of this college, *Pro Deo et Patria*.

The dedication that I would like to proclaim in behalf of the students and faculty of Loras College is:

Loras College is dedicated to truth. It seeks to widen the horizons of man and the beauty of the universe. It claims no monopoly on truth, but it has a vital interest in all truth: in the world's dust as well as in man's destiny; in man's reason as well as in God's mystery.⁸

This college declares anew its religious commitment. It is certain that it can make its greatest contribution to the city of man and the city of God by unfolding the mystery of faith rather than by denying it.

Wholeheartedly I state that Loras College accepts this role in the community of man. It seeks not to be a privileged institution: only to be a major contributor. It has a gift to give, the gift of intellect.

Loras College pledges that gift to preserve what is best of its past, and to explore what is most needed for the future. In doing so, I pray that the wind of the Holy Spirit will continue to blow across the Loras we love. God bless you.

"EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD OF TOMORROW"—ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. CULVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am particularly concerned with the problem of providing quality education for young Americans. Nothing can be more important to our future strength and progress as a nation, and the Congress has recognized its obligation in this field in passing innovative legislation to aid in the education of elementary, secondary, and college students and to help in the construction of additional academic facilities.

Because the Congress appropriately does have an expanded role today in education, it is critical that we give increased attention to the question of where education should be directed best to meet the challenges of the future.

Last weekend, the oldest college in the State of Iowa, Loras College in Dubuque, inaugurated its 19th president, Msgr. Justin A. Driscoll. At that time, our distinguished colleague from Iowa, Congressman JOHN CULVER, was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree "in recognition of his dedication to Iowa and to the Nation, and of his qualities of integrity and statesmanship."

On that same occasion, Congressman CULVER participated in an academic symposium, where he delivered a speech on "Education for the World of Tomorrow." Mr. CULVER is well qualified to address himself to this subject, having been educated in the Iowa public schools, Harvard College, Emanuel College in Cambridge, England, and the Harvard Law School.

His remarks are both provocative and relevant to our consideration of the question in the committee and on the floor. I would therefore like to bring his address to the attention of the House, and ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

EDUCATION FOR THE WORLD OF TOMORROW
(An address by Congressman JOHN C. CULVER at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, October 20, 1967)

Archbishop Byrne, Monsignor Driscoll, Reverend fathers, sisters, distinguished platform guests, faculty, students, and guests of Loras College, to participate in the ceremonies inaugurating your president and to receive recognition from Loras College is a very great honor. To be invited to join this symposium is an added pleasure, though I bring to it less of the scholarly and spiritual competencies of Dr. Littell and Father Greeley.

As one who only a few years ago completed his own program of formal education at law school, I must applaud the generous reversal of academic procedure at this college. I received my degree—apparently without conditions—this morning. I am only asked to take this oral examination in the afternoon. It is the first time I have encountered such liberality in academic administration. Need-

⁴ Dr. Sidney A. Rand, "Ways Through the Wall," Address at Wartburg Academy, Dubuque, Iowa, July, 1967.

⁵ Report of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1967.

⁶ Howard Mumford Jones, "The College and The World," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, November 12, 1966.

⁷ *Ibidem*

⁸ McInnes, op. cit.

less to say I am grateful to become an accredited member of the Loras community in so accelerated and painless a fashion. I hope my remarks will not place me in any probationary status.

I have been asked to explore a promethean theme—"education for the world of tomorrow". In approaching this formidable task I shall try to heed the caution of a great philosopher, "nothing is so firmly believed as what we least know." What credentials I possess as an educator spring very largely from the perspective I have had as a member of Congress at a time when it has enacted the most significant legislative programs for education in all our history.

Never has there been such a cumulative and concentrated attention by elected politicians to the broad spectrum of educational needs than there has been during the immediate past.

During the two Congresses in which I have served education has had a dominant place. And there will probably be few Congresses in the years ahead when this will not be true.

For nearly a century after the path-breaking establishment of the land grant college system in the Morrill Act of 1862, Federal laws directly affecting education were a rarity. During World War One, Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act to help states in programs of vocational education. The aftermath of World War II saw the enactment of the G.I. Bill of Rights which greatly enlarged individual opportunity for higher education. In the searching analysis of national needs and deficiencies that followed Sputnik, the National Defense Education Act sought to improve the quality of training and the range of opportunity in critical areas of science, language, and specialized areas of research. To be sure, defense and atomic research and development, as well as new institutions such as the National Science Foundations, influenced education—but these were heavily concentrated in a small number of large institutions of higher learning.

What has happened in the 1960's is wholly different by any measurement and by any perspective—Federal, State, local, or private—education has come to play a role which is much more than marginally or incrementally different from all that came before. There has been a genuine revolution whose end is not yet in sight.

If we look back less than seven years to 1960, and ahead less than eight years to 1975, we can easily see the magnitude of the change in numbers:

Since 1960 pre-school enrollment has almost doubled; by 1975 it will almost have tripled at seven million.

Elementary school population, which is the steadiest, will still have increased five million in 15 years.

Secondary school enrollment will rise to 17 million in 1975, whereas it was 9.6 million in 1960 and is 13.7 million today.

Attendance in institutions of higher education rises most steeply—from 4 million in 1960 to 6.5 million today to almost 11 million only 8 years hence.

Our Nation today has more than 57 million students, more than 2½ million teachers, more than 125,000 separate institutions, more than 200,000 educational administrators.

These statistics tell but part of the story. About 5 years ago we reached another divide: For the first time there were more people employed in serving rather than manufacturing jobs. The white collar superceded the blue collar. With a greatly accelerated rate of knowledge and technology and with the shortening of time between discovery and actual production of a new product or process we can anticipate that by 1975 ¾ of our working population will be producing goods and services that have not yet been developed.

Indeed, we can go still further. Since 1960 we have had a larger education than labor force, if we calculate all those engaged in full or part time education or labor re-training or significant adult and employee training. Though one cannot be absolutely precise, there was a rough equivalence between the labor and learning forces in 1960; in 1975 the learning force will be more than 50% the larger.

All expenditures for education—public and private—now just exceed 52 billion. This approaches 7% of our gross national product. In dollar terms this is almost a five fold increase in 15 years and double in the percentage of the gross national product.

These are inescapable and irreversible trends. As Daniel Bell has pointed out, "the ganglion of our society is knowledge". We are the first nation in human history in which more than half of the employed population is not involved in the production of food, clothing, houses, automobiles, or tangible goods. We are the first society in which professional and technical employment exceeds 10% and will rise to 15% in but ten years.

And ours is the country in all history which has most responded and prospered from the spur of innovation, of widely diffused, and anticipated change. The place which the university has as a central institution for setting goals, channeling change, and training in this setting is perfectly evident. The resilience and creative adaptations which our colleges and universities have made is a remarkable part of this story. Loras has shared in this adventure.

But for this college and for most others the next decade will become even more demanding and place an even greater strain on your qualities of leadership and human ingenuity.

For education is no longer confined to the ivy covered buildings of the college campuses—but has expanded into every aspect of American life.

Students no longer study social causes and changes from text books alone—they are an active agent in those causes and those changes.

They no longer sit in only the classrooms and learn about political history—they march in Alabama and register voters in Mississippi.

They are no longer content with the established regulations and received traditions alone, they wish to test their validity and have a voice in their adoption to present circumstance.

As the student examines his society from this new perspective, he becomes more aware of its failures, and the failure of traditional text book concepts to come to grips with the problems which he sees.

And at the same time that these frustrations are building, he is being administered what John Gardner the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has penetratingly described as "the anti-leadership vaccine".

At the very point in our history when we most need imaginative, creative leadership, we are too often immunizing many of our most gifted young people against any disposition to assume leadership.

"The young person today", says Mr. Gardner, "is acutely aware of the fact that he is an anonymous member of a mass society, an individual lost among millions of others. The processes by which leadership is exercised are not visible to him, and he is bound to believe that they are exceedingly intricate. Very little in his experience encourages him to think that he might someday exercise a role of leadership."

But instead of overcoming this undertow away from leadership, a college education may only reinforce it.

The more a young person is indoctrinated into the settled attitude and frozen techniques of his chosen profession or life study, the less he is directed to the larger and

emergent problems with which a true leader must be concerned, and the less interested he becomes in leadership as such. He develops skills—as a scholar, a scientist, or a professional person—which make him more capable of leadership only in the very narrowest sense—superior skill within his own limited field.

As a result, Mr. Gardner says, "the academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself."

The college must guard against the trend of educating too many experts to advise and criticize and too few leaders to lead and mobilize.

The result too often is a disaffection from the established institutions of our society, a retreat to the politics of protest instead of action, alienation and withdrawal rather than involvement—a contagious escapism.

I do not intend to suggest that colleges are the principal culprits or the principal cures for our national failures. They are but one of the vital agencies for social change and human betterment.

Nor do I believe that student protest has an unerring instinct for either truth or reform. Some of it is frivolous: some of it is imitative: some of it is shallow in its perceptions.

Nor do I ask that colleges be responsive to every gust of change, to each headline in the morning paper, to every cry of alarm from either the politician or the expert. Learning for its own sake, detached judgement, and continuity are still values to be prized in our colleges.

But I do say that our leading colleges and universities must give their students and communities an appreciation for the contour lines of social change and for the mainsprings of danger and need.

There is little doubt that the highest need we have now—and will continue to have—is a better understanding of our urban society. We need to know more about its tensions, the quality of life within cities, the ways in which cities, large and small, can better absorb and guide the inevitable changes of this decade and the next ones.

Yet, as Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, the archbishop of Washington pointed out in a pastoral letter this summer:

"As Christians, our efforts . . . have been feeble. Our support of desperately needed programs . . . has been far less than adequate. Our education system throughout the Nation moves at a snail's pace in its faltering effort to readjust to the rapidly changing situation in our crowded urban centers."

Congress must assume its share of the blame for the present situation. It would be bad enough if we had done nothing at all. But to start programs like the War on Poverty, the Teachers Corps, or Rent Supplements, and then to refuse to fund them adequately once we have aroused expectations, only further intensifies very legitimate frustrations. And this represents the real crisis—fear which breeds resentment, a resentment which feeds even greater hostility, a failure of understanding and communication.

How did it happen, in a Nation built on traditions of justice and opportunity?

From the point of view of the average American, the Negro has seen steady and continuous progress. In a relatively short period of time, the entire structure of discriminatory legislation has been torn down. Negro Americans have entered the professions, the Cabinet, and now the Supreme Court. And the taxpayer himself has paid for poverty programs, education, job training, and urban renewal.

He asks himself then, what reason can there be for violence, or frustration, or dissatisfaction with present progress. But, for

the young man in the ghetto, that progress is not very significant.

He is no longer in servitude, but he has only about one chance out of three of getting a job that pays as much as \$60 a week.

He can vote, but even if he has been able to stay in high school and earn his diploma, he very likely has only the equivalent of an eighth grade education in Dubuque.

He can eat at the same lunch counter as a white man, but he probably has only 70¢ a day to spend on food.

Somehow, if progress is to have meaning, we must bridge the communication gap between the inner city and the suburbs, between rural and urban America, so as to develop public understanding and compassion which can be translated into positive action. It is in this task that the college is an indispensable link and can play a crucial mediating role.

I am not just talking about training priests or social workers—although it is essential that they have this understanding and compassion.

I am talking about developing these attitudes in the engineers, the chemists, the doctors, the accountants who will be the voters and taxpayers and opinion makers upon whom our progress as a nation will depend.

I contend that we have no more to fear from the hippies and the protest marchers, who have assessed the problems of our society and have withdrawn, or gone into sterile rebellion, than we do from upstanding young men and women who are abiding by the rules, learning their physics, or business administration, or mechanical drawing, and going out to assume their roles in society with no personal concern about the problems of their less advantaged fellow Americans and about the cities in which they work.

Without abandoning or distorting its search for excellence, or its independence, the college and university can contribute importantly in this search. It can teach the students to be challenged and stimulated by the ambiguity of our society, not, in David Reisman's phrase, "threatened with complexity." Progress depends on compromise and students must be lead to the ability to cope with problems for which there are no wholly satisfactory solutions in the short-run.

It can re-direct itself toward the development of generalists in an age of specialization. More than anything else, our society needs today the man who can be the skilled professional, yet is not imprisoned by his subjects or calling. A sense of relevance, a capacity to observe trends and needs outside one's special field, a vision of larger issues need not be the casualties of our specialized age. And finally, colleges and universities must critically evaluate their resources and capacities for meeting the growing pressures of an urban civilization. No one college can span the whole panorama of urban crisis, but there is hardly any which cannot make a distinctive contribution if it seeks to. Each college must discover where its strength lies, what it can do, where it can stimulate creative responses, where it can be relevant.

But equally colleges can no longer be isolated, either from their communities or from each other. Whenever possible colleges must develop productive associations: in common access to university facilities, in arrangements which permit interchange of students in special fields, in consortia which will make feasible graduate or special training beyond the resources of a single college, in common systems of information retrieval and storage when this becomes economical and available not many years from now.

In turn, our private colleges have a right to look to business for greater support in the years ahead. Corporate help to the private college has not reached its potential, especially in smaller and newer universities in the city. The frontier of the city is critical for business. Both self-interest and public

interest should lead business to a greater support of independent colleges.

The Federal Government, in its turn, will continue to give an important but not commanding share of support to higher education in various ways. But it, too, must be vigilantly self-critical so that a balance is maintained in our patterns of education and that inertia and habit do not become the sole arbitrators. There is all too great a tendency for assistance to flow to a few institutions, in a few regions, in a few fields. Defense, space, and atomic energy, for example, absorb more than 3/4 of all the trained people available for the exploration of our scientific and technological frontiers. In contrast there are but a few persons directing their energies to finding better technologies for low cost housing, to the economics of poverty, to the aesthetics and amenities of city life.

A Congressman can offer to a college only the advice of the amateur. He is somewhat in the situation of the old football coach whose system was described as "punt and pray." But the student and the teacher in the university or college have the opportunity to think reflectively and deeply about the decisive questions of our age. It is here that the first impulses for change and responsible action most commonly are aroused. It is here that knowledge is unified and complexity subdued.

That is why the American people expect so much from their institutions of learning. That is why it looks to them for relevancy and initiative. That is why we value their unwavering commitment to truth.

If there is any certainty about the world of tomorrow, it is that this reliance will grow.

ADDRESS BY PAUL C. WARNKE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS—ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Paul C. Warnke, appeared before the Advocates Club of Detroit and delivered an extremely penetrating address on a topic of most serious concern to all the world, the antiballistic missile. Secretary Warnke, in lucid and logical terms, outlined and reviewed the reasons behind the decisions of our Government in this regard and made it obvious that we continue to seek an understanding with the Soviet Union in order to avoid ascending to another level in a mutually costly arms race. While this new weapons system is oriented toward a Chinese threat, he also expressed our desires for an understanding with the Chinese in this horribly vexatious area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this excellent statement for the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF PAUL C. WARNKE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS, BEFORE THE ADVOCATES CLUB, DETROIT, MICH., OCTOBER 6, 1967

At the start, I'd like to express appreciation and apology. Appreciation, of course, for

the opportunity to be with you tonight and to share in your fellowship. Apology, for the fact that, inescapably, I'm cast as the skeleton at the feast.

But this is the risk that any group accepts when it invites a speaker from the Department of Defense. We deal necessarily with the implements of death. And today the implements of death are no longer reasonably selective but instead are the frighteningly impersonal instruments of mass destruction.

In recent talks in Washington a high official of an Asian country observed that: "The world is governed by the logic of deterrence." This got me to thinking. And I concluded that the statement, like so many oriental axioms, had a great deal of merit.

As has already been explained, my training and background is that of a lawyer. Accordingly, I have had day-to-day experience with the fact that adherence to the laws that are essential to the preservation of an ordered society turns largely on two kinds of motivation. One is the voluntary recognition by responsible members of society that its ability to function depends on conformity to the rules that protect both person and property. But responsible individuals never make up the totality of any population. Other elements can be compelled to comply with the basic laws only because they are deterred from anti-social conduct. Deterrence exists in the likelihood that deviation from society's rules will lead to punishment. And the surer that punishment, obviously, the stronger the deterrent becomes. As the likelihood of punishment diminishes, the likelihood that the laws will be flouted by irresponsible individuals obviously will increase. This inverse ratio is what has stimulated the lively debate as to whether our courts have gone too far in seeking to assure the Constitutional rights of those accused of crime. Concern about individual liberties admittedly detracts from the certainty that the guilty will be punished. But it also protects those mistakenly charged with crime and prevents the distortion of our free society into a police state.

Without getting further into a debate outside my present field, I would note that fear of punishment can never deter all criminal conduct. There is, in any population, a residuum of individuals who cannot be expected to adhere to the rules of organized society either from innate responsibility or from apprehension that departure from them will result in punishment. There are individuals who, because of mental incapacity or a desperate conviction that they have nothing to lose, will stumble into criminal behavior or will seek determinedly to tear at the fabric of the society in which they find no place. This last phenomenon—of which you in this city have special knowledge—underlies the riots that have troubled our internal serenity during the past few years. Other crimes of course result when normally law-abiding persons are prey to panic or passion that overcomes both their normal responsibility and the fear of punishment.

Tonight I would like to discuss with you the implications of these universal principles to the field of international security. Because, as I see it, the logic of deterrence that permits any particular society to function applies as well in the sphere of international relations.

In the world community, the generality of nations conduct themselves responsibly because they recognize that their mutual interest is served by the responsible conduct of world affairs. A few, regrettably, may have to be deterred from aggressive efforts to better their own position at the expense of their neighbors. Today, we possess a deterrent force that permits certain response in sudden, sure and shattering strength. By all the logic of deterrence, therefore, fear of reprisal should be sufficient to make us safe from nuclear attack from any source.

Yet, as you know, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced last month that the United States had decided to deploy a system of anti-ballistic missiles designed to protect against the possible Chinese threat.

This decision, of course, has very substantial implications for the area of my responsibility as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. I would like therefore to consider with you this evening the likely impact of our deployment on international security.

In particular, I want to talk about the likely impact of this deployment upon our efforts to maintain the security of Asia.

In addition, I will discuss its bearing on our efforts to negotiate a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and to secure an agreement on the limitation of offensive and defensive strategic systems with the Soviet Union.

I would like to stress that, contrary to the charges of some critics, this decision to deploy resulted solely from a careful consideration of the security interests of the United States and its allies. Outside and unrelated pressures were not a consideration. The positive advantages of the deployment, which I will discuss in a moment, seemed to us to make the decision to proceed a prudent, though close, choice.

Secretary McNamara has made clear his strong opposition to attempting to deploy an ABM system designed to protect our cities against a large Soviet attack. He is opposed, not because he does not want to protect our cities, but because of his belief, which I share completely, that this is not possible, that the Soviets would respond to our deployment in ways which would leave our cities still exposed. The deployment thus would not increase our security.

Secretary McNamara's consistent and determined public opposition to a Soviet-oriented ABM system has led to the misconception that he has been opposed to any ABM deployment. In fact, the Defense Department has been giving close consideration to the question of a Chinese-oriented ABM deployment for some time. Let me just remind you briefly about what we have said previously on this question.

Secretary McNamara first noted the need to consider the possibility of a small nuclear attack on the United States by a nation other than the Soviet Union in February 1965. In his posture statement to the Congress for the coming fiscal year, he identified the risk of such attack as emanating from Communist China. However, he stated that the "lead time for that nation to develop and deploy an effective ballistic missile system capable of reaching the United States is greater than we require to deploy the defense."

The following year, in Mr. McNamara's posture statement to Congress in February 1966, reflected his encouragement at the technical progress being made in the development of the ABM subsystem, particularly the long-range interceptor missiles. It also recorded his judgment that the system could be effective against the foreseeable Chinese threat. I quote him:

"Initially, the deployment concept for NIKE X contemplated the point defense of only a relatively small number of the larger cities against a heavy Soviet attack. Subsequently, as I described last year, it became feasible to consider extending protection to smaller cities by modifying certain NIKE X subsystems and using less extensive and sophisticated deployments. Even this concept, however, still left most of the country vulnerable to great damage even from a small attack deliberately designed to avoid our defended cities.

"This situation has now been changed significantly by the emergence of the possibility of developing an area missile defense based

upon the use of long-range interceptor missiles which I mentioned previously. Against a relatively light attack, such as the Chinese Communists may be able to mount in the mid-to-late 1970's, an area defense might be very effective, offering the possibility of avoiding any substantial damage."

However, a production decision was not then deemed necessary. At background briefings and press conferences in November and December 1966, following the Chinese explosion of a nuclear weapon in a missile, Mr. McNamara maintained his position on the timing of a decision to deploy an ABM system to defend against the Communist Chinese threat.

We have delayed any decision until now, because one was not needed until now. During the interim, research and development on the Chinese-oriented system continued and the system has been greatly improved. However, the point in time has now been reached when we had to make the decision to deploy if we were to have a system in the field by the time the Chinese could begin to deploy ICBMs. The Chinese could test an ICBM as early as this year and they could have an ICBM capability of some significance by the mid-1970's. Since it will take us five years to deploy our defensive system, we need to begin now if we are to have our defense ready before the Chinese are capable of an attack against the United States.

I have frequently been asked, over the last several weeks, whether our deployment of an ABM system oriented against mainland China does not represent a step backward from our stated desire to try and build bridges to China. Some have suggested that the decision represents an exaggerated view of the actual threat which China poses to the United States and our friends and allies in Asia. I believe that close examination of our motivation in deploying a Chinese-oriented ABM system shows these views to be incorrect. A basic element in our approach to relations with the people of mainland China remains that stated in the President's State-of-the-Union Message. There he said:

"We shall continue to hope for a reconciliation between the people of mainland China and the world community—including cooperation in all the tasks of arms control, security, and progress on which the fate of the Chinese people, like the rest of us, depends.

"We would be the first to welcome a China which had decided to respect her neighbors' rights. We would be the first to applaud were she to concentrate her great energies and intelligence on improving the welfare of her own people. And we have no intention of trying to deny her legitimate needs for security and friendly relations with neighboring countries."

Our ABM deployment will in no way interfere with these efforts. We continue to hope that China will evolve in a way which will make better relations with the leaders in Peking possible, not only on arms control matters but on a broad range of issues.

While hoping for changes in Chinese behavior, we have sought to analyze Peking's current views and attitudes which might affect their use of their developing nuclear capability. We see no reason to conclude that the Chinese are any less cautious than the rulers of other nations that have nuclear weapons. Nor do we believe that Peking is at all ignorant of the effects of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, we believe that the Chinese leaders understand the devastation which the use of nuclear weapons by China could bring to the mainland of China itself. Indeed the Chinese have shown a disposition to act cautiously, and to avoid any military clash with the United States that could lead to nuclear war.

In light of this view of China, then, why did we conclude that a Chinese-oriented ABM system makes sense?

I think one way to approach this question is to consider a hypothetical world without the Soviet Union. In that case, I believe that few would think our decision required much in the way of explanation. Hostile action by China is, unfortunately, not totally inconceivable; and nations have always deployed those defensive systems which could blunt an offensive attack from a possible enemy. If we can create, for a sum well within our means, a system which will greatly reduce if not eliminate the casualties we might receive from a Chinese attack, logic and prudence require that we do so.

Of course the Soviet nuclear force does exist; and, as Mr. McNamara pointed out in San Francisco, one of our major concerns in proceeding with this deployment was that it not trigger an acceleration of the strategic arms race with the Soviet Union. Because of this possible danger—which I wish to return to briefly at the end of my talk—we might well have concluded not to proceed with the deployment without some more specific reason to believe that it would enhance our own security and that of our friends and allies in Asia.

What then is the specific reason that led us to go ahead?

My answer to this question might begin by reemphasizing that the cornerstone of our efforts to maintain the security of Asia is our ability to deter aggression. Our fundamental strategy remains deterrence and I want to make it clear that our decision to deploy a China-oriented ABM system is wholly consonant with this strategy. The obligations of the United States in Asia stem most specifically and most importantly from our treaty commitments with a number of Asian nations. In addition, at the time of the first Chinese nuclear detonation in 1963, President Johnson declared that: "Nations that do not seek national nuclear weapons can be sure that, if they need our strong support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I have no doubt that the United States would honor these assurances, whether or not we deployed an ABM system. Our European allies have come to understand that the United States has both the will and the capability to deter Soviet aggression in Europe, even though the United States cannot achieve a credible first-strike capability that would prevent Soviet response, and even though American society—but not US strategic forces—would be destroyed in a Soviet attack. Against the much reduced Chinese capability, there should be no doubt as to the credibility of our deterrent.

But despite this, some speculation had developed in Asia, and perhaps also in Peking, as to whether, when Chinese ICBMs were targeted on American cities, the United States would shirk its responsibilities in Asia. Some asked, for example, if the United States would really be willing to risk Detroit to save a small Asian nation. Similar questions had been asked by our European allies as the Soviet nuclear delivery capability grew. As we have learned in Europe, we must be prepared to run risks if our assurances are to have any credibility. But doubts did exist and we concluded that a Chinese-oriented ABM system could serve a valuable role in removing these doubts. In deploying this system, we seek to emphasize the present unique disparity in strategic nuclear capability and technology between the US and China and to extend well into the future the credibility of our option for a nuclear response.

Our deployment will substantially reduce the Chinese Communist capability to threaten American cities and should leave, neither Asia in general nor the Chinese in particular, with any uncertainty as to whether or not the United States would act to prevent the Chinese from gaining any political or military advantage from their nuclear forces. We recognize that this deployment by itself

would not be sufficient. The United States will continue to need to act in ways which make clear the credibility of our deterrent. And both we and Asian nations have to continue to maintain the necessary conventional forces to deal with lesser threats. But we believe our ABM deployment is an important, useful step. Hopefully the China-oriented ABM system will also help buy the time within which other political, economic, and social forces can be at work to bring China into responsible participation in an international community. We fully intend to help these forces do their work.

This, then, is how we believe the deployment of the Chinese-oriented ABM system will impact upon our efforts to maintain the security of Asia. What about the physical security of the United States itself?

Secretary McNamara referred, in his speech, to the possibility of Chinese miscalculation, and in a later interview with *Life Magazine* he made clear that his concern is with the situation in which there is the danger of a pre-emptive attack. Let me explain briefly what our concern is. In a crisis which they had brought on, if the Chinese came to believe that the United States might attack, they might be tempted to launch a pre-emptive strike, hoping to bring down at least a part of the American house in the face of the total destruction, or even only the destruction of their nuclear forces, which at the moment of crisis they feared we were about to wreak upon them. No matter how miscalculating or irrational such an act might seem—and I did say earlier we believe the Chinese leaders to be no less cautious than the rulers of other nations that possess nuclear weapons—under the current circumstances it is not impossible. This danger will pass when China develops, as the Soviets have done, a secure second strike capability. In the interim, we decided that as long as it was within our technical capability to provide an effective defense against this danger, prudence seemed to dictate that we deploy that defense which would further deter the Chinese from pre-empting, and eliminate or greatly reduce our casualties should they engage in such an act.

I am sometimes asked whether China could not nullify our defense by smuggling a bomb into the United States in a suitcase, or blowing up a junk off the California coast. Such activity is, unfortunately, technically feasible, although the magnitude of the potential destruction is not comparable to a missile attack. Moreover, we believe such action is extremely unlikely. As I have suggested, we do not view the Chinese as basically irrational. The suitcase bomb would require the Chinese, in the absence of an immediate crisis, to decide in advance that they wish to destroy an American city, knowing full well the retaliation which would follow. Such behavior seems to us totally unlikely. What our defense is directed toward, as I have said, is the possibility that at the height of a crisis the Chinese leadership might panic and press the button. Our ABM deployment will guard against that contingency, improbable though it too may be.

Of all the possible implications of our ABM deployment, none concerned me more than its impact on our efforts to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty—or NPT—designed to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. We analyzed very carefully the likely impact of a deployment on the on-going negotiations relating to the NPT. We came to the conclusion that our Chinese-oriented ABM deployment should make it easier, and not harder, for countries in Asia to sign the NPT. The increased credibility of the United States deterrent, which we expect to result from our deployment, should make even clearer the lack of any need for independent national nuclear forces in Asia. If any country in the area has been tempted to develop a nuclear capability because of a fear that we would

cease to deter China, our actions should have removed these uncertainties.

One concern in regard to the NPT has related to the question of equality in obligation. The non-nuclear nations have been asserting, quite understandably, that the United States and the Soviet Union should demonstrate a willingness to move toward nuclear disarmament if they are asking the other nations of the world to forego the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Both we and the Soviets have accepted this obligation, and the language of the draft treaty reflects that commitment. However, that commitment does not mean, and I do not believe that other countries would want it to mean, that the United States would refrain from taking all steps that might improve our deterrent against China until China, herself, is prepared to enter into satisfactory arms limitation agreements. I believe our Chinese-oriented ABM deployment meets this criteria.

An additional cardinal point is that this ABM deployment does not signify in any way a change in our attitude toward the Soviet Union. Our view of that relation can be briefly summarized.

The relationship between any two great powers whose interests and activities are as far-reaching as those of the United States and the Soviet Union must necessarily be complex, a mixture of cooperation and conflict. During the first decade after World War II, the U.S.-Soviet relationship was primarily one of conflict. But in recent years, despite areas of deep disagreement—Vietnam and Germany are some examples—the necessity of co-existing in a highly armed world has led us to cooperate where we have interests in common.

Most important of these common interests is the need to prevent nuclear war. Each of us now has the ability to destroy the other's society. This is the most awesome power that men have ever possessed. We do not fear that the present leaders in the Kremlin, or any foreseeable successors, will employ recklessly or irresponsibly the vast resources of destructive capability which they possess. Similarly, we think that we have given them ample evidence that they need fear no such behavior on our part. The costs of nuclear irresponsibility would be too great.

For this reason, another interest we share with them is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. This interest is not wholly altruistic: we are concerned not only that new possessors of nuclear weapons may employ them against each other, or against a non-nuclear state; we see an even greater danger in the possibility that the use of nuclear weapons by a third country could precipitate a war which would end in a nuclear exchange between the two so-called Superpowers. In our view, and I would think in that of the Soviet Union as well, each additional nuclear power increases the possibility of nuclear war, by design, by miscalculation, or even by accident.

The U.S. and the USSR have a third related interest: that of reducing the vast amounts of resources which each of us now devotes to military forces and to military hardware. That other and more rewarding uses can be made of these resources is so self-evident, despite the over-all prosperity of American society, that it demands no elaboration. The same is true, to an even greater degree, in the Soviet Union. Similarly, for the health of the world we inhabit, both we and the Russians should be devoting more of our national wealth to improving conditions of life within the less-developed countries.

Our decision to deploy a Chinese-oriented ABM system reflects no lack of concern about what Secretary McNamara called the "mad momentum" of the nuclear arms race. But because our proposed deployment poses no possible threat to the Soviet deterrent, it

need lead to no acceleration of the Soviet-American strategic arms race.

We will continue to seek cooperation and agreement with the Soviets whenever our interests converge. In particular, we will continue to hope that by parallel actions, or by formal agreement, the two countries can undertake to limit their strategic offensive and defensive forces. There is no reason to believe that our deployment decision makes them any less willing to enter into talks, or to take parallel actions. In fact, although we cannot be sure, the contrary may well be the case. Moreover, should these talks occur, we hope to avoid bogging down in the perennially difficult issue of international inspection.

Since the end of the second world war, the United States has sought an international agreement to end, or at least slow down, the nuclear arms race. The United States has always insisted, and will continue to insist, on adequate verification of any arms control agreement with our potential adversaries. In deciding whether we need an agreed international inspection system, we assess very carefully the capability of our own unilateral verification systems. As you know, the United States agreed to the three environment test ban treaty, with the full concurrence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the consent of the United States Senate, despite the lack of provisions for international inspection. We did so because we were confident, and remain confident, that we can detect any violations of the treaty by the Soviet Union or any other signer. We have, in fact, accurately detected Chinese and French atmospheric nuclear tests.

In considering any possible agreement with the Soviet Union to level off or reduce strategic offensive and defensive systems, or even the possibility for parallel action on the part of the two countries, we may have to depend on our own unilateral capability for verification. We believe a number of possibilities for parallel action and even for formal agreement with the Soviets would permit our reliance on unilateral means of verification. Other more far-reaching agreements, particularly any involving substantial reductions, would require agreed international inspection. You may be sure that we would not accept any agreement unless we had high confidence in our ability to monitor Soviet compliance, either by unilateral means or by agreed inspection procedures. But you may be sure, also, that we will pursue, with diligence and determination, our efforts to bring the nuclear arms race under control.

For we do not believe that continuation of that nuclear competition is without risk, and that risk lies only in seeking agreement with our potential enemies. We now have lived with danger throughout most or all of our adult years. We recognize that all courses have risks and that it is folly, not prudence, to continue on the path that the world has been following without seeking a better way. The U.S. is fully prepared for an end to the nuclear arms race. For the sake of our own and future generations, we can only hope that neither the attitudes of our adversaries nor the gulf of suspicion which separates us will prevent attainment of the objective which is in our common interest.

It is my belief that the decision to go ahead with an ABM system directed against potential Chinese threat will not retard, but rather will advance our progress toward that objective.

NEW 7-YEAR NOTES BRING HIGHEST INTEREST RATES SINCE 1921

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. Government, with the world's strongest economy offered to pay 5½ per cent on a 7-year note of \$1.5 billion.

This is the highest interest rate offered on a Government security in 46 years—since 1921 in the administration of Warren G. Harding.

Mr. Speaker, this fantastically high interest rate—5½ per cent—is being paid on a brandnew type of Government security—a 7-year note. As my colleagues remember, the House voted on June 21 to change the definition of a Treasury note from 5 years to 7 years. At the time, many of us argued that the lengthening of the definition of a note would lead only to one result—higher interest rates.

Now we have reaped the high cost results of giving the Treasury authority to market 7-year notes.

Obviously, the results of this first sale plainly tells us that the 7-year notes are to be another vehicle for high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for a great Nation like this to pay 5½ per cent on securities fully backed by the credit of our Government. This is just unnecessary gouging of the American taxpayer.

Contrary to some published reports that accompanied the news of this 5½-per cent interest rate, the Federal Reserve System is not meeting its responsibilities in holding down interest rates. The Federal Reserve, if it wanted to operate in the public interest, could support the Government bond market and force down these interest rates. They, of course, are doing the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, when the House considered the debt ceiling legislation in June, we were assured that the approval of the 7-year note would have no effect on interest rates. In other words, the House was led to believe that it could authorize these new notes—which bear no interest ceiling—without requiring the American taxpayers to pay more interest to finance Government borrowings. Mr. Speaker, I quote from page 9 of the Report on the Public Debt Limit, H.R. 10867, as filed by the Ways and Means Committee on June 16, 1967:

The extension of the definition of U.S. notes to those debt instruments with a maturity of not over 7 years by itself will not have any effect on interest rates, but it will afford the Secretary of the Treasury aid in preventing still further shortening of the maturity of the debt.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the first sale of these notes established the highest interest rates in Government securities in 46 years. I must respectfully suggest that the 7-year note did indeed have effect on interest rates—a pretty tragic effect for the taxpayer who must foot this additional interest cost.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to put an end to this interest rate nonsense. We have already budgeted \$14.2 billion for interest payments on the national debt in this fiscal year. This sum,

of course, was calculated before we learned that the Treasury would be financing huge chunks of its debt at 5½ per cent interest.

The interest costs are the largest item in the Federal budget outside of expenditures for defense. Mr. Speaker, we must take the action necessary to require the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates and thus lighten the tremendous burden on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article in this morning's New York Times detailing the Treasury's offering of the 7-year notes:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 26, 1967]
COST OF U.S. LOAN HIGHEST SINCE 1921—
TREASURY OFFERING PAYMENT OF 5½ PER-
CENT TO SELL NOTES TO HELP COVER DEFICIT
(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, October 25.—The Treasury offered today to pay the highest interest rate on a Government security in 46 years—5½ per cent—to sell a seven-year note to help cover the big deficit in the budget.

The offer of \$1.5-billion of the new notes was accompanied by an offer of \$10.7-billion of 15-month notes bearing a 5½ per cent annual interest rate.

Proceeds from the combined sale of \$12.2-billion will be used to pay off \$10.2-billion of maturing securities and raise \$2-billion cash to meet the Treasury's needs.

The last time a Treasury issue carried an interest rate as high as 5½ per cent was in an offering of \$311-million in June, 1921.

Rates in the money markets have been rising steadily, reflecting a mammoth demand for borrowed funds, including the big demand from the Treasury itself.

MONETARY POLICY EASY

The high rates have not reflected, as in many past periods, a tight money policy by the Federal Reserve Board. To the contrary, monetary policy has been aggressively easy for months, but it has not achieved lower interest rates because of the huge demand for credit.

The \$2-billion in new cash to be raised by the offering announced today will bring the total of the Treasury's cash borrowing to more than \$16-billion since June 30, apart from replacement of maturing issues.

Frederick L. Deming, Treasury Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, said this would be the last cash offering in this calendar year, but he projected on a "rough" basis the need for an additional \$5-billion in the first quarter of 1968. This figure, he said, assumed passage this year of the Administration's proposed tax increase, and it would be larger without the tax increase.

Some of the huge borrowing since mid-year reflects the Treasury's normal seasonal need, which varies with the timing of tax collection. But much of it also stems from the large budget deficit, which will exceed \$12-billion even if the tax bill is passed.

TAX RISE HELD VITAL

Although there will be no more new issues by the Treasury this calendar year, Mr. Deming said, the Government does plan to issue \$1-billion to \$1.5-billion of "participation certificates" before the end of the year. These are shares in pools of Government loans and have the technical effect of reducing recorded expenditures and the deficit in the budget.

Mr. Deming said that without a tax increase the Treasury would have to borrow \$20-billion to \$22-billion in the current fiscal year, in contrast to no net borrowing at all in the last fiscal year.

This \$20-billion to \$22-billion, he said, would be piled on top of a credit market that normally supplies only about \$70-billion a year to all types of borrowers—from businesses to home buyers.

Thus without the tax increase he said, the Treasury's financing task "could become pretty difficult." He emphasized, however, that the Treasury would always be able to raise what it needed, and that other borrowers would be the sufferers.

The maturing securities involved in today's offering are a 4½ per cent note issued in May of last year and a 3½ per cent bond issued in March, 1961.

Of the total maturing of \$10.2-billion, all but \$2.6-billion are held by the Federal Reserve or other Government investment accounts.

Today's issue will be sold Monday, with payment due Nov. 15. Individuals and financial institutions will put in subscriptions, which are certain to exceed the \$12.2-billion offering. Then the Treasury will "allot" subscriptions according to the amount of the excess.

An individual can put in a subscription through his bank or broker, with the smallest denomination of the new securities being \$1,000. These small subscriptions are usually allotted in full.

An individual can also wait until the issue has been sold and then purchase the new securities in the market. In that event, he might have to pay a small "premium"—say a total of \$1,010 for a \$1,000 bond—which would have the effect of reducing his effective interest rate.

DRAFT DODGERS IN WASHINGTON

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the "Protest the War" gathering in Washington on October 21 and 22 has attracted much attention, both in this country and abroad. It has also been widely publicized. My own information about it is derived from this publicity, since I saw no part of it.

What I have seen and read is all in quite close agreement. I am led by this general consistency to believe that both the press and the broadcasters have attempted to be as constrained and accurate as possible, and I want to commend them on this attitude, and to say that they have performed a useful public service.

The picture I get is a gathering of some 50,000 or more people from every section of the Nation. In the main, the whole consisted of two widely differing groups. One group, by far the larger part of the whole, was made up of people whose appearance and conduct offered little ground for criticism, however much one might disagree with their motives. They had a right to be in Washington and have their say.

The other group separated itself from the main body late on the afternoon of October 21, and moved from the Lincoln Memorial across the river to the Pentagon. It consisted of not more than 5,000 individuals—I hesitate to use any more complimentary word. Their appearance and dress are described as disreputable beyond belief in a civilized society. Their language is described as too vile and vicious for any slum gutter. Their be-

havior made a mockery of their purported "Peace" mission.

The police force needed to restrain this second group had a difficult—and dangerous—task. The pictures and the descriptions available to me indicate that the police used great restraint. There are those who regret this moderation, and I would not be inclined to quarrel with them.

One aspect of this "protest," if that is what it was, may need some careful scrutiny. And that is: Who paid the bill to get this mob into Washington and keep them there approximately 2 days?

The well-dressed group apparently were sufficiently affluent to take care of their own expenses. Many of these were believed to be college students. If they traveled from faraway points, their expenses were undoubtedly heavy. But we may wonder what their parents were thinking of, or if these same parents are disposed to bewail the necessary cost of educating their children. One mother, it is reported, had come with her daughter, and took the trouble to explain what a noble movement the whole affair was. It is reasonable to assume that some, perhaps many, of the college students went along for the lark. That may be the parents' business, and not ours, though it may raise some questions as to the compulsory support of public education.

But as to the other crowd, a far more serious question arises. It is not reasonable to believe that many of them could have assembled the where-withal for a bus ticket to some nearby city. Who paid the toll? Was it some benevolent philanthropist who wanted to see the boys have a good time? Is there some peace organization in this country which collects funds to support movements which may be as illegal as they are disloyal? Or does the money come from the enemies of this Nation whose normal procedures include subversion and disruption?

It is time, in my opinion, to set on foot some investigations which we could depend on to get at the truth by means which the people could trust. I do not know what those means might be. But I do know that such disorders do not subside of themselves. Nor can they be charged to circumstances which involve discrimination. Those who engage in them do not mean well to this Nation, and the attitude of the Government toward them should be neither to ignore them nor to tolerate them.

OIL AND GAS DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the support of our colleagues for the discharge petition filed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], to bring his bill to reduce the oil and gas

depletion allowance to the floor of the House.

As the sponsor of legislation on this important issue, I feel strongly that Congress has a clear duty to act promptly to close this and other notorious loopholes in our tax structure. On August 10, I wrote Chairman MILLS, proposing that the question of tax reforms be considered by the Ways and Means Committee in conjunction with the forthcoming hearings on the surtax. I pointed out that it was very difficult to convince a citizen of the equality and justice of a system that wrings the last cent of tax from his wages or salary while certain privileged groups evade their proportionate share by various devices which, however justified originally, are now rightly termed "loopholes." There is little risk in today's economy in capital invested in large business enterprises, and the favoritism shown various businesses and industries can no longer be tolerated in our tax structure.

Irrespective of our fiscal conditions, justice and equity would demand that these flagrant inequities be corrected. Our present difficult situation makes such action imperative. Surely it is the better part of wisdom to make each segment of the economy pay its fair share toward keeping our Nation strong and solvent rather than to cut back already inadequate programs dealing with our urban crisis.

The new study of the middle-income family by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that, despite the tremendous growth in our economy and better wages and salaries, factory and white-collar workers are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain, let alone raise, their standard of living in our vaunted affluent society. Taxes take a sizable portion of their hard-earned income whereas, in comparison, oil and gas companies still enjoy a tax allowance granted 50 years ago when drilling was a costly venture involving great risk. Ever since, despite the fact that this country has developed enough oil to last for hundreds of years, the gas and oil giants have been able to deduct 27½ percent of their income before they even begin to think about taxes. The plain fact is that there is now very little risk involved in the oil industry. The figures in Dunn's Review show that oil has almost the lowest rate of failure of any industry in the United States. Furthermore, the depletion allowance does not, as it was originally intended to, stimulate the exploration and discovery of new wells—most of it goes to those who are doing very little or no high-risk exploration.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, 20 major oil companies paid corporate taxes at a rate of 6.3 percent. In contrast, the average American corporation pays a Federal tax of 48 percent. Several other companies skipped paying any taxes at all that year, despite large profits. And a lucky few actually got tax refunds on their profitable enterprises. Even the poorest individual taxpayer contributes at a rate nearly four times higher than most oil producers.

Our able colleague's discharge petition offers the membership an opportunity to

demonstrate our belief in a tax system based on equality of sacrifice and ability to pay. Tightening this and other loopholes would bring substantial revenues to the Treasury, ease the burden on the average taxpayer, and strengthen the national will and resolve to meet the critical challenges at home and abroad.

REV. BERNARD A. PETERS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure to attend a testimonial dinner in honor of the Reverend Bernard A. Peters, OSB, the pastor of St. Joseph's Parish, Maplewood, N.J., at the Military Park Hotel in Newark, N.J., on Sunday, October 22, 1967. The occasion commemorated the 40th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood and was a manifestation of the affection and esteem in which Father Bernard is so deeply held by his parishioners and other friends of all creeds and walks of life. As pastor of St. Joseph's Parish for the past 24 years, Father Bernard has been a true shepherd to his flock, but he has also looked beyond the confines of his parish to encompass all members of the community in his kindly and understanding concern.

The unflagging zeal, remarkable ability, and selfless devotion to duty, which have characterized Father Bernard's priestly labors are reflected in the groundbreaking ceremonies for a new church on Sunday.

In recognition of his dedicated service to God and man, the township of Maplewood adopted a resolution honoring Father Bernard which I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD. I should also like to include an article about this truly noble man that appeared in the Newark Evening News of October 19, 1967:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, in the year 1967, Rev. Bernard A. Peters, O.S.B. celebrates the Anniversary of his fortieth year as a Priest and Monk of the Order of St. Benedict; and

Whereas, almost a quarter of a century of his life has been devoted to St. Joseph's Parish in Maplewood; and

Whereas, on October 22nd, 1967 the Clergy, parishioners and many friends will join in this celebration honoring this humble man of God; and

Whereas, upon this day, a long cherished dream and ambition will be marked by the ground-breaking for a new Church at St. Joseph's.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Township Committee of the Township of Maplewood, County of Essex, State of New Jersey, assembled this seventeenth day of October in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven, that this governing body, for itself and on behalf of the citizens of this community, do hereby proclaim this memorable October 22nd, 1967, as Rev. Bernard A. Peters, O.S.B., Day in Maplewood and invite all citizens to pause and reflect upon the Godly work of this man and his dedicated

interest in all facets of life in Maplewood and join with his many friends in thanks for this continued generous help.

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution be suitably engrossed and presented to Rev. Bernard A. Peters, o.s.s.

EDMUND T. HUME,

Mayor.

W. MELBOURNE KNOX, Jr.,

Township Clerk.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Oct. 19, 1967]

FATHER BERNARD PRIEST 40 YEARS

St. Joseph's Parish, Maplewood, will break ground for a new church Sunday as it celebrates the 40th anniversary of the ordination of its pastor, Rev. Bernard A. Peters, OSB.

Father Bernard, who started his 25th year as pastor in August, will turn over the first spadeful of earth in ground-breaking ceremonies immediately after the 12:30 p.m. Jubilee Mass. Mayor Edmund T. Hume and other municipal officials will be present.

The new church will be located on the present parking lot at Prospect Street and Hilton Avenue. The million-dollar construction program will include replacement of the present rectory, which is an old frame building, and demolition of the parish hall.

Built in 1922, eight years after the founding of the parish, the parish hall was St. Joseph's first church. As the parish grew and the school was built in the 1930s, Masses were offered in the school auditorium, which was later converted into a chapel. This space will revert to school use.

Sunday evening Father Bernard will be honored at a testimonial dinner at the Hotel Military Park, Newark. Guests will include Archbishop Thomas A. Bolland, Bishops Joseph A. Costello and Martin W. Stanton and Abbot Martin J. Burne, OSB, head of the Benedictine community in this area.

Born in Newark, Father Bernard attended St. Benedict's Preparatory School here and St. Anselm's College and Abbey in Manchester, N.H. He was professed a Benedictine in 1921 at St. Vincent's Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa., and was ordained a priest in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Manchester, in 1927.

Father Bernard's first assignment was as a teacher of German and history at St. Benedict's Preparatory School, where he served 11 years. He began his parish work at St. Elizabeth's in Linden and later was stationed at Blessed Sacrament in Elizabeth. He went to Maplewood in 1943, succeeding the late Rev. Richard E. Studer, OSB.

Eugene Gergely is general chairman of the testimonial dinner committee. Rev. Malachy M. McPadden, OSB, assistant pastor, is adviser.

EXTENSION OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER IS GOOD NEWS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is a blessing to this country that Admiral Rickover has agreed to continue to serve as the head of naval nuclear propulsion and in his related capacities for an additional 2 years. It is my understanding that he did this at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the past two decades I know of no one who has con-

tributed more to the security of the United States than has Admiral Rickover. His brilliant and totally dedicated services are still urgently needed as we move into an even more tense and dangerous era when the Soviet Union is building up its sea power and deploying it globally and Red China is becoming an increasing threat.

Our Nation is fortunate, Mr. Speaker, and I commend Admiral Rickover for again heeding the call to serve.

TWELVE-MONTH SESSION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult for those of us here in the Congress to see the forest for the trees. We are too close to the situation to see a satisfactory solution to many of our problems. For this reason, I depend a great deal on the many fine newspaper editors in my State who give careful study to congressional activities. Most of us would like to get back home as soon as possible to get around and see our constituents and get the feel of the issues from that end.

My good friend Roswell Falkenberg, of the Selma Times-Journal, thinks we might make some changes in our legislative sessions and has borrowed some ideas from one of our colleagues from California [Mr. BROWN]. I would ask that this editorial from the October 24 Selma Times-Journal be entered in the RECORD for all of our colleagues to read:

TWELVE-MONTH SESSION

By their own rules, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives must adjourn by July 31 each year, except in time of war or national emergency.

But what Congress proposes it can easily dispose of by passing a resolution extending a session, which it has done as a matter of course for, lo, these many years.

Law also requires that appropriation bills be completed by July 1, the beginning of the fiscal year.

More than three months after that deadline, the present Congress has acted on only a handful of them. Many agencies and departments are struggling along on the basis of continuing resolutions, which authorize them to operate from month to month on stopgap funds provided on the same level as their spending during the previous year.

Older solons have fond memories of intersession vacations of four to six months, when a lot of fences could be mended back home. The present Congress has been in session for nine months, and if this were an election year, it would certainly be under attack as the "Do-Nothing Congress of 1967."

Of course, if this were an election year, that rattling you would have heard along about Labor Day would have been congressmen stirring their legislative bones like mad.

Since in these hectic times there is no likelihood of a return to the leisurely ways of the past, why don't congressmen face reality and plan on regular 12-month sessions, with perhaps a modest adjournment in the summer?

A number of them think it may be a good

idea. Among them is Rep. George E. Brown Jr., Democrat of California.

He points out that paperwork continues in a congressman's office the year around, anyway, whether Congress is in session or not. Even when congressmen take time off to rub elbows with—and have arms twisted by—the folks back home, the legislative process plods along at a fairly steady pace.

There is no real reason why all legislation must either be rammed through in the early months of the year, he says, or, as it usually turns out, be hastily passed in the last ones. A slower pace could be conducive to more deliberative and higher quality legislation.

He adds that a longer session should mean better scheduling so that legislation involving a time factor could be enacted at an appropriate time. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

The stopgap method of funding may be all right for an established bureaucracy that is conducting business as usual, "but it creates untold misery on programs such as our aid to education, antipoverty efforts and the like."

Not knowing whether they are going to get more, less or the same money as the year before, administrators are reduced to guesswork and hope in their planning.

"One would think," says Brown, "that with year-round sessions, Congress could solve some of these problems."

Or perhaps one may not think so. But year-round sessions would at least save Congress the trouble of having to pass an extension resolution every July.

"AGE OF EDUCATION" PROGRESSES SLOWLY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe most Americans are aware of the progress we are making as a nation to provide an adequate education for all of our citizens. As President Johnson observes, this period in our history may become known as the age of education.

But I doubt that most Americans are aware of how little opportunity for education exists in other parts of the world. One-third of the world's children who are of school age have no school to go to. More than 700 million people over the age of 15 cannot read or write.

An editorial published recently by the Hartford Courant calls attention to this serious world problem. It points out that inadequate resources for education in other countries may produce peoples whose aspirations turn to disillusion and perhaps revolt.

Mr. Speaker, I insert that editorial for the RECORD:

"AGE OF EDUCATION" PROGRESSES SLOWLY

President Johnson recently expressed the hope that American historians would call this the "age of education." To support his aim he noted that 12 per cent more poor children attended college during the past six years. High school drop-outs declined from 25 to 18 per cent. College students getting federal grants will increase from 500,000 in 1965 to 1.2 million in 1968. Federal spending for both education and health has risen from four to 12 billion dollars.

A few days after Mr. Johnson listed the advances, a five-day international session opened in Williamsburg, Va., to review educational opportunities in other parts of the world. The kind of news the 170 educators from 52 countries heard was reflected in the conference title, "World Crisis in Education." Some of the challenges to be met are discouraging, to say the least. For instance, one-third of the world's school-age children have no school to go to. There are still more than 700 million illiterates over the age of 15. Developing nations which do have schools are not using them to full advantage. Children of the working classes, or residing in rural areas, or unlucky enough to be born girls, have less chance for schooling than the rich, the city child or those lucky enough to be born boys.

Rene Maheu, director general of the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, outlined the facts at the sessions' opening. He noted that "of all inequalities none is more . . . intolerable to men's feelings . . . than inequality of children's access to the light of the mind."

Through "tremendous efforts" many developing nations have reached their numerical enrollment targets. But these can only be maintained through other nations' help to the tune of two billion dollars in the next three years, Mr. Maheu said.

In a 14-page statement reviewing their findings, the delegates ask more than that. They want "even a 10 per cent" re-allocation from the \$150 billion nations spend annually on defense, a statistic dubbed "a dismal commentary on the world's priorities." They also suggest the creation of an international consortium to distribute school aid, and an international education year to "mobilize energies and inspire world-wide initiative."

The experts fear "inadequate resources" may produce a "populace whose aspirations have turned to disillusion," and perhaps revolt.

If the richer countries rally forth to help the poorer in greater measure, perhaps President Johnson will get more than his wish. Historians one day may call this the age of education in a worldwide sense. But the U.S. surely must be among "those who have" to help the "have-nots."

VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Secretary of the Navy, Paul R. Ignatius, announced that Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover was being asked to continue on active duty for an additional 2 years. This extension is of vital importance to the security of our Nation. The commanding worldwide lead in naval nuclear propulsion which this Nation has enjoyed and I am confident will continue to enjoy is attributable in very large part to Admiral Rickover. The recent announcement concerning his continuation on active duty, I am sure, will help assure the maintenance of our position of primacy in this vital field of national security.

Admiral Rickover reached the mandatory age of retirement on January 27, 1964. The Secretary then announced that Admiral Rickover's contribution to the

Navy and the Nation would be needed "for so long as he is willing and able to serve his country." The Secretary of the Navy then recalled him to active duty for 2 additional years.

This first 2-year extension was fortunately followed by another extension in 1965. This latest 2-year extension will permit Admiral Rickover to go on with his vital work concerning our national security.

I wish Admiral Rickover continued success in his work. I think it is appropriate to quote from the opening remarks of a talk the present chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, made at the launching of the U.S.S. *Narwhal* on September 9, 1967. The *Narwhal* is one of our newest submarines. It was also developed under Admiral Rickover's direction. Senator PASTORE, addressing Admiral Rickover, said on the occasion of the *Narwhal* launching:

I appreciate beyond measure of words the memento that comes to me today from your very hand. Through your inspiration, your vigor, and your determination, America today maintains primacy in nuclear ship propulsion, and I think that I bespeak the sentiments of the people of this great nation when I say that we owe you a deep debt of gratitude, and the best way that I can explain it is to say we thank God for Admiral Rickover.

We still maintain a lead in the world in the field of naval nuclear propulsion. As I have stated before, this lead is attributable to Admiral Rickover. In view of the emphasis the Soviets are placing on improving their nuclear submarine fleet which includes both missile-launching types and attack submarines, it is very important that we intensify our efforts to maintain our lead. The growth in the Soviet's nuclear navy was reported on in an article this morning in the Washington Post. This article summarizes the 70th annual edition of Jane's Fighting Ships which, according to the article, states the Soviets are stepping up production of warships.

In closing I would like to reiterate the sentiments expressed by Senator PASTORE last month at the launching of the *Narwhal*, which I quoted above.

We owe Admiral Rickover a deep debt of gratitude, and the best way that I can explain it is to say we thank God for Admiral Rickover.

VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the sentiments that have been expressed about the extension of Vice Admiral Rickover's service.

The Congress has received a tremendous amount of inspired assistance from Admiral Rickover in its efforts to establish both a submarine and surface nuclear Navy.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Armed Services Committee, I want to say that it is always a pleasure to hear the testimony of the admiral for his statements and opinions are always given honestly, forthrightly, and in deep concern for the security of our Nation.

It is a pleasure to add my voice to those who are expressing appreciation for the work of the admiral. No man is more deserving of the recognition being given to him here today.

The Nation profits much in the wise decision to extend the admiral's active duty service. America's supremacy in nuclear propulsion of naval ships is due to his genius. We owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

AGWAY, INC., THIRD ANNUAL MEETING

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 19-20, Agway, Inc., held its third annual meeting at the Onondaga County War Memorial, Syracuse, N.Y.

Agway, Inc., is a taxpaying cooperative owned and directed by 99,000 farmers in 12 Northeastern States: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. Agway's principal objectives are to help its members farm more efficiently and profitably and to assist them in the marketing of many of their agricultural products.

Agway was formed in 1964, and its headquarters are located in Syracuse, N.Y. At the third annual meeting, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture came to Syracuse to address the gathering of Agway members to outline the general state of American agriculture today. I would like to join with Mr. Jonathan Davis, Agway's president; Mr. Harold G. Soper, its chairman of the board; and Mr. Edmund H. Fallon, executive vice president and general manager, and with all of the employees and members of Agway in extending to the Secretary of Agriculture our sincere appreciation for his taking the time to pay tribute to Agway by his attendance.

The Secretary noted that Agway is the Nation's biggest cooperative and it provides a broad range of diversified services to its farmer-members. To quote from the Secretary's address:

I am impressed by the size of your organization, by the diversity of your interests—stretching from the traditional marketing and farm supply sector to supermarkets, canning, insurance and transportation—and by the interest of your membership, as evidenced by this crowd here today.

I only wish there were cooperatives like yours, for American agriculture desperately needs the skilled management, economic power, and farmer-control represented here.

In addition to the great benefits which Agway presents to its farmer-members who live in Onondaga County, the location of its headquarters in my district has done much to stimulate economic and social progress in my district. I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to acknowledge the nearly 800 Agway employees who live and work in Onondaga County and to congratulate them from being a part of this "now" organization.

As I have said before, Agway is dedicated to making farming a more efficient, more profitable way of life for its members. An organization that is moving rapidly into every aspect of farming economy, and doing it effectively, is the kind of instrumentality which is needed today to counter all of the adverse forces which are driving farmers from the land in record numbers.

During the course of the annual meeting, Mr. Davis, Agway's president, and Mr. Fallon, the executive vice president and general manager, related the state of Agway and its progress after 3 years in operation. Its sales for the third year were up \$22 million to \$393 million, making it No. 170 on Fortune's list of the 500 largest industrial corporations.

To quote Mr. Davis' report:

Agway's diversified services are having a warm reception. The building program, as an example, is becoming very popular because of Agway's farm-oriented background, and the demand for silos surpassed our ability to produce them. The supply centers, with their variety of products and services, have exceeded their volume goals in most cases. Petroleum distribution had a good year.

Secretary Freeman pointed to the importance of strong and diversified cooperatives when he noted that—

In a time when almost everything the farmer buys costs him more each year, I think it is significant that where cooperatives are strong, prices of supplies have risen less—and in some cases have declined—as other supply prices have risen drastically.

Those of us here in the House whose districts are principally urban and metropolitan in nature, with a small farming population, are aware of the flight that is taking place from the land. I must assume that the main reason a man abandons his land is because he cannot make it a going operation any longer.

Secretary Freeman devoted most of his address to the efforts the Government was making to see that farm prices and farm income would be sufficient to support the agricultural community as we know it today. The efforts of organizations of farmers, like Agway, to keep the costs of farming at a feasible level through the free enterprise system are commendable. I know that I am in tune with many of my colleagues when I extend to Agway and to its farmer-members my congratulations on their efforts and my hope that the growth and the progress they are making will continue to the benefit of themselves, and through them, for all Americans. I share the hope of Agway's president when he said:

I picture Agway as a huge grain combine, more modern and sophisticated than any other yet produced. The parts were delivered

from the three factories represented by our three predecessor cooperatives. After three years of assembly and laboratory testing, it has proven to be field-worthy. All that it needs now is some minor field adjustments to bring it to top performance. With your help, these are rapidly being made. I am sure that this year we will cut a swath that we are all proud of.

THE MASSACHUSETTS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to say that my home State, Massachusetts, has the oldest guaranteed loan program for students in the Nation. And I am proud of its success. It has helped many students obtain desired higher education and promises to help many more. Since the inception of the program in 1956, 54,900 loans totaling \$36,814,389 have been made. The demand for these loans has been growing at an increasing rate. During the last fiscal year, July 1966 through June 1967, approximately 14,000 loans were made. In the first month of the new fiscal year alone, almost 2,000 additional loans were obtained. Massachusetts is successfully making college financially feasible for thousands of young people.

This year, Massachusetts has also made these loans available to vocational students for the first time. Under the provisions of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act, Massachusetts received \$48,155 in Federal "seed" money specifically earmarked for vocational and technical students. Since its availability in March 1967, a short 7 months ago, an estimated 890 loans totaling \$910,000 have already been made. As more potential vocational students become aware of the loans, this program will gain momentum too.

The Massachusetts program also attests to the fact that the American student is a good credit risk. The Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp. guaranteed \$15,932,000 in loans to students from its start in 1957 through February 1966 and has paid only \$108,000 in claims for a remarkably low loss ratio of sixty-eight one-hundredths of 1 percent. Recovery effort in the Massachusetts program has thus far resulted in \$14,000 collected, so that an ultimate net loss ratio of about one-half of 1 percent seems indicated.

Mr. Speaker, some indication of the demand and the probable success of guaranteed loans can be obtained from a look at the Massachusetts program. On a nationwide scale these loans probably have the greatest potential for aiding students in overcoming financial barriers to higher education of all present aid programs.

With the growing numbers of students in college, the growing need of a higher education and the growing cost of this

education, we can expect the demand for these loans to continue to go up geometrically. Whereas the NDEA student loan program made loans to 854,000 students totaling about \$610 million during its first 7 years, from 1958 through June 1965, the guaranteed student loan program made almost half that number in its first fiscal year of operation alone.

From July 1, 1966, through June 30, 1967, 328,943 loans totaling \$248 million were made. What the unmet demand for loans of this nature and what the potential demand for them is cannot be completely assessed. However, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, has estimated that some 2 million students will want to make use of this program nationwide in 1972. To insure that the supply of guarantee funds will meet the demand for loans the program needs our support now.

YORKTOWN DAY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1967, I attended ceremonies in commemoration of the 186th anniversary of the victory at Yorktown, Va. On that occasion we were privileged to hear a splendid address by Brig. Gen. Bernard W. Rogers, U.S. Army, Commandant of Cadets, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. General Rogers was graduated from the Military Academy in 1943; is a Rhodes scholar; and has just recently returned from duty with the 1st Infantry Division in Vietnam.

General Rogers was introduced by Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, U.S. Air Force, retired, a distinguished resident of Gloucester County, Va.

The address of General Rogers contains historical information of much value and considerable interest. I am pleased and privileged to include it in the Record at this point and commend its reading to all patriotic Americans. The text of General Rogers' address follows:

General Tunner, Mr. Goddin, Members of the Yorktown Day Association, distinguished guests, fellow patriots:

It is a personal pleasure for Mrs. Rogers and me to be with you on this occasion commemorating the 186th anniversary of the American and French victory over the British forces at this historic site. The last time Mrs. Rogers and I had the opportunity of visiting Yorktown was 16 years ago while assigned as Aide-de-Camp to General Mark Clark at nearby Fort Monroe. So for us it is good to be back.

Having just returned from duty with the First Infantry Division in Vietnam where I was privileged to serve with some of the finest soldiers in the world, I find it gratifying that celebration such as this are being conducted to memorialize the deeds of American arms and pay tribute to the valor of the American soldier. Particularly is such a celebration fitting and timely in this period when a negative attitude against commemorations of the achievements which form our heritage exists

among an extremely active and vocal minority of our populace. It is victories such as we celebrate here which have played a significant role in the development of our nation and, as a consequence, should not be forgotten. Thanks to your organization, this one never shall.

As I was preparing for this visit, I was interested to review the ties which connect the Military Academy at West Point to Yorktown. As you know, in the early days of our country, the Hudson River was a link of strategic importance connecting Canada and the colonies. Dominating this avenue of approach were the Hudson Highlands, which cut across the river about 45 miles above New York City. An important terrain feature in the Highlands was West Point, a point of land which seemed to thrust itself into the river. We find that key figures in the Continental Army played significant roles both at West Point and here at Yorktown. Foremost among them was Washington's chief engineer, Louis DuPortail, who made a useful contribution to the defenses at West Point and who later directed the siege operations on this battlefield. Also Washington's commander at West Point was Henry Knox, who commanded the artillery for the Yorktown campaign. It is also interesting to note that the Continental Army arrived here from the Hudson Highlands to engage Cornwallis, and after the battle most of the Army moved back to those Highlands. At West Point, as here, you will find the air of history and great events pervading the atmosphere.

On Yorktown Day this year we are not just celebrating the end of British domination of our young nation, not just the combined victory of American and French forces over the forces of Lord Cornwallis, but we are also giving recognition to the important role played by the Continental Army in defeating a supposedly more effectively-trained British force. It was a Continental Army which by 1781 had, in Washington's words, become "a respectable Army" and was as effective as those Armies of Continental Europe; it was in fact the forerunner of our modern Army. But the achievement of this level of professionalism by 1781 by Washington's troops had not been easy.

You will recall that prior to the creation of the Continental Army the colonists had depended upon the militia for their military needs. Under this militia system, every able-bodied man in the township was required to arm and equip himself, participate in a varying amount of drill and training, and be ready for action on short notice, usually to defend his family, home, and friends. Officers in the militia were relatively ignorant in things military and were selected by the men; the rank of general often was conferred by virtue of birth; enlistments were short-term; and control was by state. Since militia were primarily geared toward local defense, they had no system of organized supply.

The many deficiencies of the colonialist militia were well known to George Washington when he was appointed in June, 1775, by the Continental Congress "to command all the Continental Forces." He had written that:

"Men just dragged from the tender scenes of domestic life; unaccustomed to the din of arms; totally unacquainted with every kind of military skill, . . . when opposed to troops regularly train'd, disciplined, and appointed, superior in knowledge, and superior in arms, makes them timid, and ready to fly from their own shadows. . . . Again, men accustomed to unbounded freedom, and not controul, cannot brook the restraint which is indispensably necessary to the good order and Government of an Army . . . To bring men to a proper degree of subordination, is not the work of a day, a month or even a year."

By the end of 1776 Washington's dis-

enchantment with the militia as he knew it led him to conclude that he hoped:

"That no reliance, except such as may arise from necessity, should ever be had in them again."

From then on he persisted in the belief: "Let us have a respectable Army, and such as will be competent to every exigency."

Recognizing the need for a trained Regular Army was one thing; achieving it was another. From the time he assumed command of the Continental Army until the victory won here at Yorktown, Washington faced the tremendous undertaking of raising, equipping and training such a force. At one stage even he, imperturbable as he usually was in the face of difficulties, was led to state:

"Could I have foreseen what I have, and am likely to experience, no consideration upon earth should have induced me to accept this command."

Washington and his command experienced the dark days of the defeats in the New York and Long Island campaigns, the retreat across Jersey. They also rejoiced at the victories at Trenton and at Princeton, although, as one historian stated:

"This feat had been accomplished by an army of . . . ragged, shoeless, ill-fed, poorly equipped, often defeated amateur soldiers. . . ."

But victories born of grit, determination, and belief in a cause were not enough to ensure success. Defeats were sustained at Brandywine, Germantown, and Philadelphia; the winter of 1777-78 was spent at Valley Forge. Discouragement ran high and professionalism was lacking in the Continental Army; but help was on its way from across the Atlantic.

This assistance came in the form of foreign professional soldiers such as Von Steuben, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, Lafayette and DuPortail who agreed, *inter alia*, to train our Army, to instill a much-needed discipline into the ranks, and to develop an organized supply system. In addition as you know, the French government sent ships, soldiers and funds to aid our cause.

With this help from foreigners, progress was made until on 15 July, 1779 the Continental Army came of age. On that night General Anthony Wayne's light infantry brigade, in a brilliantly planned and executed attack, captured the heavily fortified position at Stony Point, New York, and proved, not only to the British, but to the world, that the Continental Army was a force with which to reckon.

Now the scene was set for the final campaigns in 1780 and '81 which led to victory. The Continental Army left its base in the Hudson Highlands in June of '81 and eventually joined with its French allies under General Rochambeau, and by October had laid siege to Cornwallis on this battlefield. As you can see from the magnificent displays the National Park has prepared to explain this battle to us, this siege was a thoroughly professional job—a fitting testimonial to the skill, training, and discipline achieved by our first professional army. But just at the time that the achievement of a regular, professional army had been realized, it was almost immediately dismembered.

Peace was proclaimed to the Army in April, 1783, and disbandment began. In December of that year Washington resigned his commission and by the end of the year the Continental Army had been reduced to a single regiment of infantry and a few companies of artillery. Without a history of military obedience to civil authority (as we know it today), the fears of the people concerning large, regular armies led Congress in June, 1784, to declare that:

"Standing armies in time of peace are inconsistent with the principles of republican government, dangerous to the liberties of a

free people, and generally converted into destructive engines for establishing despotism."

Congress therefore directed that the entire army be disbanded except about a hundred officers and men to guard material stored at West Point and Fort Pitt. One unit which was preserved was Alexander Hamilton's old company of artillery which now exists as Battery "D," 5th United States Field Artillery, the only link of the present Regular Army with the Continental Army. I might add that "D" Battery of the 5th Field is performing magnificently today in Vietnam, based at Phuoc Vinh as an element of the First Infantry Division Artillery.

Although Washington, Hamilton, Knox, Von Steuben and many other wartime leaders wished to retain a regular professional army, Washington recognized that the fear of a standing army and the costs associated with maintaining it made such a goal unattainable. He was led to declare that:

"The jealousies of a standing Army, and the evils to be apprehended from one are remote; and in my judgment, situated and circumstanced as we are, not at all to be dreaded; but the consequences of wanting one, according to my ideas—is certain, and inevitable ruin."

Thus Washington moved in the direction of a small standing army to serve as a constabulary on the Indian frontier, with a portion of the militia being grouped together and trained in time of peace in such a manner as to permit their prompt mobilization as a Continental Army; therein we find the basis for the manner in which we have maintained our readiness for emergencies since that time. But as an integral part of his plan was Washington's insistence that there be established a full-fledged military academy where warmaking could be the subject of very careful schooling. Reflecting on the war just finished, Washington said:

"Of so great importance is it to preserve the knowledge which has been acquired thro' the various stages of a long and arduous service, that I cannot conclude without repeating the necessity of the proposed institution, unless we intend to let the science (of war) become extinct, and to depend entirely upon the foreigners for their friendly aid, if ever we should again be involved in hostility."

Alexander Hamilton also continued to urge Congress to establish military institutions to perpetuate the art of war and to furnish: "the means for forming a new and enlarged army, fit for service in the shortest time possible."

Later, President Jefferson, acknowledging that if the Regular Army were to be very small it ought at the same time to be very good, was instrumental in founding the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1802.

Starting modestly with only 10 cadets who were attached to the Corps of Engineers, the Military Academy has now grown to over 3,300 cadets undergoing training. This number will increase to 4,400 by 1972.

A further tracing of the evolution of our modern Army from the end of the 18th Century would reveal that, just as was the fate of the Continental Army, following all wars—or threats of wars—well-trained, well-organized, disciplined, professional military forces have been demobilized as the conflict or threat subsided. But our review would also show that growing out of the experience of the Army which was fielded at Yorktown 186 years ago (and reinforced by our experiences in subsequent conflicts) was the continuing need for an institution charged with producing those regular officers who in turn could mold the civilians from a "nation at arms" into an effective fighting force. Thus we have the link of the United States Military Academy to this battlefield at Yorktown.

Subsequent events have led our country

to realize the need for such academies to deal with the science of war as conducted by our various type naval forces and air forces. It is these academies (along with our other sources of regular officers) which provide the trained professionals who can assist this country in the transition from peace to war and develop the Regular Armed Forces foreseen as necessary by those leaders serving their country when the professionals of the Continental Army fought on these grounds.

That the Military Academy at West Point has perpetuated the professional heritage of the Continental Army may be attested to by those persons who have been associated with our Army fighting in Vietnam. (I know that the same may be said of the other service academies but I restrict my remarks to the service with whom I fought.) Our Army in Vietnam is one of which General Washington would indeed have been proud. It is the most highly professional Army the United States has ever fielded. Our soldiers are selected with care, rigorously trained, superbly-equipped, and placed in Regular units commanded by highly competent officers. As with the Continental Army at Yorktown, today's soldiers in Vietnam are highly-motivated and dedicated to the cause for which they are fighting. In short, they are professionals, just as were the Continental soldiers who fought here. Nor should we forget the outstanding assistance being rendered by our military advisors in Vietnam, comparable to the help given our fledgling Continental Army by foreign professional soldiers. And, just as we remember with great pride those soldiers of the Continental Army of nearly two centuries ago, so should every citizen of this nation be proud of our servicemen fighting for us today on the fringes of liberty in Southeast Asia.

And who is this American soldier in Vietnam? He is a boy, about 19 years of age, armed and in uniform, who did not choose to be there. He would have preferred to remain at home; comfortable; enjoying the many attractions and conveniences available to Americans; secure in the company of his family, his friends, his sweetheart. Thoughts of those persons at home creep into his mind, even at times when he is trying to force himself to concentrate on the battle at hand. And in the jungles and rice paddies of Vietnam, this smooth-checked, bright-eyed, enthusiastic boy becomes a man. He lives with fear, he lives with carnage, he lives with death. Burned forever into his memory are ugly sights and awesome sorrows which at times are almost too much for a boy, just turned man, to bear. He kills the enemy but questions the waste and folly of war. He sees his buddy killed beside him and asks why? Why was it his turn to go today and not mine? He exults in the victories won by his outfit, but he weeps with grief while attending the memorial services for his buddies who fell in the fight. He understands the cause for which he is fighting; his enthusiasm, dedication and motivation are contagious. He looks with disgust at reports of those back home who question his being and fighting in the far-off place. He dismisses such reports with a shrug, remarking "Those guys back home just don't know what it's all about."

You will see your soldier in Vietnam digging his defensive fighting position in a driving monsoon rain, up to his waist in water and mud, stopping occasionally to bail out the position with his helmet. Or you will find him combating the heat and misery of the jungle floor. But whatever the conditions, he will greet you with a big smile and reassure you: "Don't worry about this position; we'll be ready; the Viet Cong will never take it."

That's your soldier in Vietnam today, a man, who knowing he has 12 months to serve in that country, has resolved to do an outstanding job for that period. To match his

spirit, his courage, his determination, enthusiasm and devotion with a comparable level of decisiveness, judgment, imagination and know-how is a challenge to every leader in Vietnam.

Today your soldier fights for you; tomorrow he may die for you, and thus never return to enjoy those things at home which run through his thoughts as he beats his way through the hot and damp jungle searching for our enemy.

So I say again, be proud of this soldier who represents you and me in Vietnam, be proud as we are of his predecessor, another professional of another fight, the soldier of the Continental Army who fought on this ground.

Thank you for permitting me to participate in your activities today, and please accept the best wishes of all of us at the United States Military Academy for many memorable celebrations in the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the rest of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of his attendance at the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations as an official member of the U.S. delegation to the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee and to include a table in connection with his remarks on the conference report.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a table on the conference report on HEW.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ZION) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. BATES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DONAHUE.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. KARTH.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9960. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12474. An act making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 445. An act for the relief of Rosemarie Gauch Neth; and

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix C. Caballero.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code; and

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the United States Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1178. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the following plans for works of improvement: Rancho Viejo, Tex.; Spring-Bull, S. Dak.; Main Street Canyon, Calif.; Big Running Water Ditch, Ark., involving a structure which provides not more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity, pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1179. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the following plans for works of improvement: Lower Black Bear Creek, Okla.; Dumphing-Beaver Creek, Okla.; Mill Creek, Tex.; Mountain Run, Va. (supplemental work plan); Richland Creek, Miss.; Pond Creek, Fla.; Yellowjacket Creek, Ga.; Cotton-Coon-Mission Creek, Okla. and Kans.; pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Public Works.

1180. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13541. A bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers,

and for other purposes (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Coast Guard Examination of Foreign Passenger Vessels—Progress Report on Increased Passenger Safety" (11th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Evaluation of Allegations of Painting Deficiencies Involving Federal Facilities in the Washington Area" (12th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee of conference. H.R. 10196. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 831). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "Search and Rescue Operations for U.S. Private Pilots Missing in Foreign Areas" (13th report by the committee) (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report (pursuant to 63 Stat. 377) (Rept. No. 864). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christos Photinos-Svoronos (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3032. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Karen Wood Davila; with amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 287. An act for the relief of Wen Shi Yu (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 155. An act for the relief of Arthur Jerome Olinger, a minor, by his next friend, his father, George Henry Olinger, and George Henry Olinger, individually; with amendment (Rept. No. 833). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 233. An act for the relief of Chester E. Davis (Rept. No. 834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 234. An act for the relief of James W. Adams and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 294. An act for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; with amendment (Rept. No. 836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SANDMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 910. An act for the relief of the es-

state of Patrick E. Eagan; with amendment (Rept. No. 837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1580. An act for the relief of John W. Rogers (Rept. No. 838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1705. A bill for the relief of Sophie Stathacopoulos; with amendments (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2281. A bill for the relief of Dwayne C. Cox and William D. Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Franklin; with amendments (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2688. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Beaury; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Sondra D. Shaw (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4818. A bill for the relief of O. P. Becken; with amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4819. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Heneman; with amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4820. A bill for the relief of Syvan H. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4821. A bill for the relief of Arnold E. Remmen; with amendment (Rept. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4936. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5853. A bill for the relief of Raymond E. Grall (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6305. A bill for the relief of Claud Ferguson; with amendment (Rept. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6890. A bill for the relief of Lester W. Hein and Sadie Hein; with amendment (Rept. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7431. A bill for the relief of Barney Elrod Construction Co., Inc.; with amendments (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HUNGATE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7882. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at certain U.S. naval stations in Florida; with amendments (Rept. No. 853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8096. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.; with amendments (Rept. No. 854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8481. A bill for the relief of

Richard Belk; with amendments (Rept. No. 855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn; with amendment (Rept. No. 856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9574. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Wojcik; with amendments (Rept. No. 857). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10003. A bill for the relief of John M. Stevens; with amendment (Rept. No. 858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10199. A bill for the relief of Lloyd W. Corbissier (Rept. No. 859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10058. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther D. Bordi; with amendment (Rept. No. 860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TENZER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Camille Anita Dobson (Rept. No. 861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11381. A bill for the relief of E. L. Townley; with amendment (Rept. No. 862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12119. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Hepworth; with amendment (Rept. No. 863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 13702. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting of any advertising of alcoholic beverages between certain hours; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 13703. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 13704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13705. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 13706. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13707. A bill to require reports to Congress of certain actions of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13708. A bill to abate the pollution of the Great Lakes and other navigable waters of the United States from sewage, wastes, oils, and detergents and to encourage water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 13709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax of 15 percent of amounts paid or incurred for construction or installation of certain water pollution control facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 13710. A bill to protect the public health from the distribution of drugs manufactured in establishments not meeting current good manufacturing practices by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 13711. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13712. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 13713. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit demonstrations at the Pentagon relating to the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13714. A bill to repeal percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 13715. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 13716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, and Mr. NELSEN):

H.R. 13717. A bill to make certain technical amendments to the District of Columbia Public Education Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. MULTER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 13718. A bill to authorize the establishment and to provide for the regulation of Federal savings institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 13719. A bill to authorize the loan of one naval destroyer vessel to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 13720. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to modify requirements necessary to establish entitlement to incentive pay for members of submarine operational command staffs serving on submarines during underway operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 13721. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13722. A bill to deem remuneration received by certain Polish employees of the U.S. Army in France to constitute remuneration for employment for purposes of the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.J. Res. 911. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 912. Joint resolution creating a Federal Committee on Nuclear Development to review and reevaluate the existing civilian nuclear program of the United States; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 559. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the Great Lakes Basin Compact and the Great Lakes Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 560. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 960. Resolution to authorize the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of production of foreign-made goods competing with domestically produced goods and of the operation of elementary and secondary schools by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 13723. A bill for the relief of Ivo Herbert Christopher Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 13724. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 13725. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Perez Camarena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13726. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Spoletni, his wife, Maria Spoletni, and their children, Tommas Spoletni and Marco Spoletni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13727. A bill for the relief of Georgios Christakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13728. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chandrabha Lal; her husband, Daya N. Lal, and two minor children, Padma Lal and Ashis K. Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 13729. A bill for the relief of Paolo Cassarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 13730. A bill for the relief of Mr. Vincenzo Cuppari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13731. A bill for the relief of Luigi F. Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khorodik Chirninian (Shirninian); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13733. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Salvatore Amato and Maria Margarucci Amato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII,

191. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Township of Randolph, N.J., relative to the selection and retirement of members of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Republicans Unfit and Unwilling to Help Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in the House of Representatives has often been accused of blind obstructionism.

Yesterday that accusation was proven beyond any shadow of a doubt.

The Republicans have elevated the word "no" into a political philosophy.

The almost unanimous Republican

vote to cripple model cities appropriations and kill the rent supplement program is a measure of Republican cynicism and distrust of our cities.

No Republican can dare go before the voters saying he really cares about what happens to the city dweller.

No Republican can now go before the voter saying he cares about the poor, the older citizen, the ghetto resident, the city man without skills, the schoolchild without proper education.

The Republican vote against model cities and rent supplements is clearly a vote to keep cities down in urban decay, wallowing in despair, riot and worse. What a miserable Republican response to the conditions which caused last summer's riots.

Where were those Republican Gover-

nors—Romney and Rockefeller—those apostles of the cities when these Republican votes were cast?

Instead of leading their Republican delegations to vote for model cities and rent supplements, these two presidential hopefuls were out on political walking tours or off attending to much less important business.

I hope and pray the American voter remembers this reactionary Republican vote on the cities.

I hope the American voter remembers the total lack of concern by Republican Governors for one of the finest urban programs in recent history.

I hope the voter remembers Mr. Romney and Mr. Rockefeller when they come around crying they are friends of the poor and friends of the city.